DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 844 UD 029 658

AUTHOR	Rotberg, Iris C., Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-Income Students. Volume II, Commentaries.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, CA. Inst. for Education and Training.
SPONS AGENCY	Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-8330-1457-9; MR-210-LE
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	319p.; For related congressional testimony, see ED 358 514; for volume I and III, see UD 029 611 and UD 029 861.
AVAILABLE FROM	RAND, 1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Finance; *Educational Improvement; Educational Policy; Educational Research; *Equal Education; *Federal Programs; Government Role; *Low Income Groups; *Policy Formation; Program Evaluation; Public Policy; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Hawkins Stafford Act 1988; Policy Analysis

ABSTRACT

The Rand Institute on Education and Training, in consultation with the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, undertook an analysis of federal policy options to improve education in low-income areas. This analysis focuses on Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the federal program for assisting disadvantaged students. This study draws on a comprehensive review of existing evaluation data, invited commentaries, and a commissioned study of federal options for school finance equalization. Results are reported in three volumes. This volume contains the invited commentaries of 91 policymakers, researchers, and educators describing the strengths and shortcomings of Chapter 1 exactly as submitted to RAND. Appendixes to this volume contain a letter soliciting commentaries and a description of the whole study. (Contains 124 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 844

RAND

Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-Income Students

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Volume II
Commentaries

Edited by
Iris C. Rotberg

UD029658

INSTITUTE ON EDUCATION
AND TRAINING

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The research described in this report was supported by a grant from the Lilly Endowment Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Federal policy options for improving the education of low-income students
/ [edited by] Iris C. Rotberg, with Kelly E. Warner and Nancy Rizor.
p. cm.
"MR-210-LE."
Includes bibliographical references.
Contents: — v. 2. Commentaries.
ISBN 0-8330-1457-9
1. Poor children—Education—United States. 2. Education and state—United States. 3. Education—United States—Finance.
I. Rotberg, Iris C. II. Warner, Kelly E., 1968– . III. Rizor, Nancy.
LC4091.F43 1993
371.967—dc20 93-36689
CIP

RAND is a nonprofit institution that seeks to improve public policy through research and analysis. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of its research sponsors.

Published 1993 by RAND
1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
To obtain information about RAND studies or to order documents,
call Distribution Services, (310) 451-7002

UD

RAND

Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-Income Students

Volume II
Commentaries

Edited by
Iris C. Rotberg

with Kelly E. Warner and Nancy Rizor

Supported by the Lilly Endowment Inc.

INSTITUTE ON EDUCATION
AND TRAINING

RAND's Institute on Education and Training conducts policy analysis to help improve education and training for all Americans.

The Institute examines *all* forms of education and training that people may get during their lives. These include formal schooling from preschool through college; employer-provided training (civilian and military); postgraduate education; proprietary trade schools; and the informal learning that occurs in families, in communities, and with exposure to the media. Reexamining the field's most basic premises, the Institute goes beyond the narrow concerns of each component to view the education and training enterprise as a whole. It pays special attention to how the parts of the enterprise affect one another and how they are shaped by the larger environment. The Institute

- Examines the performance of the education and training system
- Analyzes problems and issues raised by economic, demographic, and national security trends
- Evaluates the impact of policies on broad, system-wide concerns
- Helps decisionmakers formulate and implement effective solutions.

To ensure that its research affects policy and practice, the Institute conducts outreach and disseminates findings to policymakers, educators, researchers, and the public. It also trains policy analysts in the field of education.

RAND is a private, nonprofit institution, incorporated in 1948, which engages in nonpartisan research and analysis on problems of national security and the public welfare. The Institute builds on RAND's long tradition—interdisciplinary, empirical research held to the highest standards of quality, objectivity, and independence.

PREFACE

The United States faces the difficult challenge of improving the education available to students from low-income families. Because family income, family educational level, and student educational achievement are closely correlated, low-income children, in effect, often face a double handicap: They have greater needs than more affluent children, but they attend schools with substantially smaller resources.

Based on these broad considerations, the RAND Institute on Education and Training, in consultation with the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, undertook an analysis of federal policy options to improve education in low-income areas. The analysis focuses on Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the nation's $6.1 billion program for assisting disadvantaged students in primary and secondary schools. It draws on (1) a comprehensive review of existing evaluation data on Chapter 1, (2) invited commentaries by 91 policymakers, researchers, and educators (teachers, principals, and administrators) describing the strengths and shortcomings of Chapter 1, and (3) a commissioned study of federal options for school finance equalization.

The results of the analysis are reported in this three-volume study.

- *Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-Income Students*, Volume I, *Findings and Recommendations*, MR-209-LE, by Iris C. Rotberg and James J. Harvey, with Kelly E. Warner, assesses the current Chapter 1 program and describes a strategy for reformulating the program to encourage fundamental improvements in the quality of education available to low-income students.
- *Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-Income Students*, Volume II, *Commentaries*, MR-210-LE, by Iris C. Rotberg, editor, with Kelly E. Warner and Nancy Rizor, provides the texts of the invited papers. These commentaries are presented exactly as submitted to RAND and have not undergone the customary RAND review procedures.
- *Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-Income Students*, Volume III, *Countering Inequity in School Finance*, MR-211-LE, by Stephen M. Barro, assesses federal options for providing supplemental funding for the disadvantaged in the face of inequity in school finance.

The Lilly Endowment Inc. funded the research. The study was completed in spring 1993, in time for congressional deliberations on the reauthorization of Chapter 1.

Georges Vernez
Director, Institute on Education and Training

CONTENTS

Preface iii

Table ix

Abbreviations and Acronyms xi

Chapter One
INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter Two
POLICY ANALYSTS AND RESEARCHERS 3
Richard L. Allington 3
Lorin W. Anderson 7
Charles S. Benson 10
Gerald W. Bracey 12
Jere Brophy 13
James P. Comer, M.D. 15
Robert D. Crangle 21
Christopher T. Cross 23
Linda Darling-Hammond 26
LaVaun Dennett 34
Denis P. Doyle 39
Joy Frechtling 41
Carolyn D. Herrington and E. Juliana Paré 43
Elfrieda H. Hiebert 48
Harold Howe II 54
Henry M. Levin 55
Floretta Dukes McKenzie 57
Edward J. Meade, Jr. 59
Stanley Pogrow 60
Lauren B. Resnick 69
E. G. Sherburne, Jr. 71
Robert Slavin 73
William L. Taylor and Dianne M. Piché 79
Thomas B. Timar 83
Michael D. Usdan 90
Linda F. Winfield 93

Chapter Three

ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES 99
Frederick H. Brigham, Jr. 99
Carolyn Hughes Chapman and Gordon Cawelti 102
Keith Geiger 106
Edward P. Keller 110
Richard M. Long 111
Richard D. Miller 113
Monty Neill 115
Chris Pipho 123
Albert Shanker 124
Janet Tinari 128
Paul Weckstein 130
Gene Wilhoit 136
Arlene Zielke 141

Chapter Four

STATE ADMINISTRATORS 149
Lois Adams-Rodgers 149
Linda Brown 152
Donald L. Carter 155
Jay K. Donaldson 156
John Ellis 159
Bill Honig 161
John Hooper 167
Robert Leininger 169
Ethel J. Lowry 173
Milton D. Matthews 175
Ed Obie 177
Virginia R. L. Plunkett 184
Merwin L. Smith 188
Thomas Sobol 194
Wayne Teague 198
Texas Education Agency 200

Chapter Five

SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS 205
Lynn Beckwith, Jr. 205
Constance E. Clayton 208
John V. Corcoran 214
Ramon C. Cortines 218
Richard A. Denoyer 221
Joseph A. Fernandez 224
Stanley J. Herman 229
E. Ray Holt 231
Paul D. Houston 233
Ted D. Kimbrough 236
Art Kono 238

Deborah M. McGriff 244
John A. Murphy 246
Robert J. Nearine 248
Eugene D. Owens 250
John A. Pfaff 252
Ronald S. Schneider 254
Robert R. Spillane 256

Chapter Six
SCHOOL PERSONNEL 257
Margaret M. Baldwin 257
Nancy D. Booth 260
Michael Citro 262
Judy Dierker 264
Barbara Funderburk 267
Judy Hampton 268
Connie Hay 270
GwenCarol H. Holmes 272
Patricia E. Lucas 274
Gaynor McCown 275
Marilyn McKnight 277
Victoria Temple Meyer 280
Kenwood N. Nordquist 282
Hilda S. Pierce 284
Maxine Skopov 285
Sheila Slater 287
Joan Stoltz 289
Teacher (anonymous) 291

Appendix
A. LETTER SOLICITING COMMENTARIES 293
B. FEDERAL POLICY OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE EDUCATION OF LOW-INCOME STUDENTS 295

References 299

TABLE

1. School District Restructuring 209

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children
CAI	computer-assisted instruction
CE	capital expense
COP	committee of practitioners
CSDP	comprehensive school development program
CTBS	comprehensive tests of basic skills
DARE	diagnostic analysis of reading errors [educational test]
DOE	[U.S.] Department of Education
EAIS	educational assessment impact statement
ECIA	Education Consolidation and Improvement Act
EDGAR	Education Division General Administrative Regulations [DOE]
EMH	educable mentally handicapped
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESL	English as a second language
ETS	Educational Testing Service
FTE	full-time equivalent
GED	general educational development [test]
HOTS	Higher Order Thinking Skills [program]
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
LEA	local education agency
LEP	limited English proficiency
LD	learning-disabled
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NCE	normal curve equivalent
NDN	National Diffusion Network [DOE]
NEA	National Education Association
NRT	norm-referenced testing
PAC	parent advisory council
PRE	percentile-rank equivalent
QUAIT	quality, apropriateness, incentive, time
SBS	survey of basic skills [test]
SEA	state education agency
SWP	schoolwide project
TIERS	Title I Evaluation and Reporting System
UFT	United Federation of Teachers
USDE	U.S. Department of Education
WCV	weight coefficient of variation

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

As one basis for assessing alternative approaches to meeting the basic goals of Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the RAND Institute on Education and Training solicited from the education community commentaries describing the strengths and shortcomings of Chapter 1 and recommending changes that might increase its effectiveness. Requests for commentaries were sent to over 400 potential respondents, including state education administrators in 50 states and the District of Columbia; a wide range of school district administrators, principals, and teachers; key education association officials; and a broad representation of researchers and policy analysts.

This volume contains the 91 commentaries that RAND received in response to the solicitation. The commentaries, while not a representative sample, reflect the diversity built into the initial list. They include 26 from policy analysts and researchers, 13 from association representatives, 16 from state administrators, 18 from school district administrators, and 18 from school personnel.

The commentaries, which were written in 1992, are grouped in this volume according to the field or affiliation of the contributor, as described in the foregoing paragraph. Each group of commentaries is arranged in alphabetical order of the author's surname. The author's title is that current at the time the commentary was written.

The commentaries offer in-depth analyses of the issues discussed in Volume I of this report, as well as about topics, for example, private schools, vouchers, and state administration, that go beyond the scope of the study.[1] While the respondents' conclusions reflect the diversity of the sample, they also focus on the key issues analyzed in Volume I.

First, there is wide agreement among the commentaries about the need to increase the level and concentration of Chapter 1 funds. This recommendation is made in the context of the growing needs of low-income school districts resulting from increases in poverty, societal problems, fiscal crises, unemployment, and immigration.

Second, the commentaries discuss the need to coordinate Chapter 1 more fully with the child's overall educational experience. They argue that Chapter 1 cannot be separated from the general quality of the school or, indeed, from the problems of poverty in the broader environment. Many respondents recommend that Chapter 1 funds be used for schoolwide improvement rather than for services focusing primarily on remedial instruction for selected groups of students. Suggestions also are made for coordinating Chapter 1 more fully with other categorical programs, as well as with health and social services.

---

[1] See Volume I, *Findings and Recommendations*, MR-209-LE, of this study.

However, not all respondents favor integrating Chapter 1 with other programs. Some argue for the continuation of supplemental programs, noting the benefits of "preventive" reading and mathematics programs, remedial programs, or programs that focus on reasoning and problem solving, some of which may work best when children are taught in small groups apart from the regular classroom.

Commentaries also note potential negative consequences of folding Chapter 1 into the broader program, for example: (1) insufficient funds to make the proposed changes a viable option; (2) the risk that Chapter 1 funds would be used as general aid if the focus on individual students were eliminated; and (3) a channeling of funds away from Chapter 1 if it were combined with other categorical programs without at the same time providing a consistent federal framework across programs.

Third, the commentaries point to a wide range of problems related to current Chapter 1 testing requirements. Respondents argue that the requirements (1) encourage an emphasis on rote learning at the expense of higher-order cognitive skills, (2) result in less funding for schools that make achievement gains, and (3) often do not provide the type of information that is useful either for accountability or for program improvement. Some of the commentaries accept the premise on which current testing requirements are based; their recommended changes are intended to improve the operation of these requirements. Others question more fundamental aspects of the requirements and argue that the system as a whole should be reformulated.

The letter from Iris C. Rotberg soliciting the commentaries is reproduced in Appendix A, and an attachment to the letter describing the research project, "Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-Income Students," is reproduced in Appendix B. This volume also contains a consolidated list of references cited in some of the commentaries.

POLICY ANALYSTS AND RESEARCHERS

RICHARD L. ALLINGTON
Project Director, National Center for the Teaching and Learning of Literature
State University of New York at Albany
Albany, New York

PROBLEMS OF THE "SECOND SYSTEM"

The current Chapter 1 program is but one piece of the "second system" of education that has emerged since the 1960s. The second-system concept may be said to include special education (especially the notion of mildly handicapped learners, such as learning-disabled), bilingual education, migrant education, vocational education, and gifted and talented education. Enormous amounts of federal funding have nurtured this system, so that in the highest poverty schools the second system employs nearly as many professionals as the regular education system.

I would argue that what is wrong with Chapter 1 is endemic to the whole of the second system and that the very existence of these categorical programs undermines any real effort at reform and rejuvenation of the regular education programs. I would argue that, as a result of the emergence of the second system, the regular education program feels little commitment to even attempt to educate all students. Until we substantially modify the method of distributing federal funds and the strategies for monitoring the rights of all children to a free and appropriate public education, we have little chance of ever attaining the original intent of the various pieces of legislation.

The second system has created a sort of learned helplessness among the regular education professional staff. The emergence of the "specialist" teacher and special certification areas and funding streams (e.g., funds tied to licensure for reading teachers, special education teachers, and bilingual and English-as-a-second-language teachers) has literally disabled the regular education staff. Classroom teachers' sense of efficacy in dealing with all but those children who learn easily has substantially declined along with their sense of professional responsibility for teaching these students.

In some schools that we have studied, as many as nine of ten classroom teachers report that it is not their job to teach mildly handicapped children mainstreamed into their classrooms. Eight of ten report that teaching Chapter 1 children is not their job. They feel unqualified and, besides, that is why the school employs the specialist teachers. The at-risk children are in their rooms, they report, to be "socialized" with other, "normal" children, not to be taught.

The position paper that Peter Johnston and I wrote for the last reauthorization—on coordination of special instruction with classroom curriculum—has helped to reduce some of the enormous fragmentation of the curricular experiences of children who participate in special instructional support programs. However, the regulatory changes have simply clarified the basic problem: that regular educators, including building principals, feel little ownership of special programs and the students that participate in them. The second system operates almost independently of the core program in most schools.

Following the federal lead, state education agencies (SEAs) have created substantial bureaucracies to manage this second system, and these bureaucracies operate independently of each other as well as of the regular education system. We find Chapter 1, special education, migrant education, and bilingual education bureaucracies producing and enforcing curricular mandates that violate the SEA curriculum guidelines, simply because no one in the second system is in close enough touch with regular education even to know when an SEA initiates a new curriculum reform (e.g., Pennsylvania, California, New York, Michigan curriculum reform versus Chapter 1, or special education program mandates—holistic curricula versus mandated specific skills contracts).

The second system bureaucracies waste an enormous amount of money as a result of a patchwork of programs, funding streams, eligibility requirements, monitoring efforts, identification efforts, and so on. They waste moneys not only through the duplication of efforts but by so binding up the regular education system that decisions are made based not on what might be best for students but on program eligibility, funding availability, and program regulations.

Our interviews with administrators from both the regular and second systems clearly indicate that hardly anyone designs programs around any notion of effective instruction. Instead, they design programs based on what funding stream they are eligible for and the likelihood that any proposal will produce a regulatory fit.

Thus, we see elementary schools with remedial reading, writing, and math programs funded by Chapter 1 and teacher aides for reading and math funded from a state special program and a special education resource room or two for children who cannot read, write, or add well enough in the regular classroom, and a bilingual program for children who cannot read, write, or add well enough in the regular classroom, and so on. We see school psychologists who have no time to meet with children, parents, or teachers; they are testing and writing reports to get children eligible for resource room programs.

We see social workers who never leave the building and rarely work with kids, parents, or teachers; but they do keep busy with referral forms and such. We see Chapter 1 teachers who work with children in groups as large as their classroom reading groups on tasks that are related to nothing, and for so few minutes that no one could expect any positive effect. We see these at-risk children, regardless of categorical identification, spending large amounts of time in transition from one setting to the next, working with the least well-trained staff more often than with anyone else on the most poorly designed curriculum materials.

We know that more often than not there is nothing special about the education offered in the special programs. Yet the questions are too rarely about the program design but turn instead on questions of learner deficits and parental inadequacy. And so it goes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We cannot simply attempt to examine Chapter 1 and do a little repair. The whole second system is wrongheaded, and its perpetuation will prove to be a recipe for disaster. We need to examine the fundamental miscalculation of the 1960s—that hiring a few specialist teachers would be less expensive than investing in retraining the whole professional educational work force. It seems now clear that we have tossed much money down the proverbial rat hole and have little to show for it beyond an enormous and voracious bureaucracy that is simply eating our high-poverty schools from within.

As a former Chapter 1 teacher and special programs administrator, I have been a long time in giving up on Chapter 1. However, the longer we study that program, and other second-system programs, the clearer the problem has become. While it will be politically difficult and potentially dangerous, elimination of the second system, including Chapter 1, should ascend to the top of the agenda for change. Perhaps, a new attempt to collapse the various programs into a single program for at-risk learners would be successful. On the other hand, while a single bureaucracy for the second system would be preferable, the fundamental flaws in that design would still remain. In my view,

- ***Chapter 1 should target funds on the schools with at least 25 percent concentrations of poor children and allow those schools to run under guidelines similar to schoolwide project rules today.***

I'd make virtually all second-system programs wealth-transference programs. Use them to move money from the suburbs to the rural and urban areas that attempt to educate the least wealthy children of the least well-educated parents with the smallest amounts of money.

- ***Funds that support the second system should be redirected at efforts to upgrade the expertise of the regular education professional staff.***

We have had no federal initiatives in this direction since the 1960s, and it shows (few comprehensive SEA efforts either). What matters in the long run is putting children with teachers who care and who are expert enough to find out what each child needs to achieve. When teachers who lack expertise are inundated with at-risk pupils and special programs, they throw up their hands and say, "These children are not my job."

Until we can alter that basic situation, things are not going to get better in schools that serve the children of poverty and usually serve them ineffectively. And maintaining special programs, the second system, will more likely undermine any attempts to upgrade the expertise and enhance the level of professional responsibility of those in the regular education system.

LORIN W. ANDERSON
Carolina Research Professor
College of Education, University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

My commentary describes eight major problems and recommends solutions. The problems identified and the solutions proposed are based on approximately six years of research on compensatory education in South Carolina.

Problem 1: Funding is based on the number of students who enter the program; the number of students who leave the program has typically not been considered in funding decisions. Numerous times during our visits to schools in South Carolina we have heard administrators voice a concern for being "too effective" because of the potential loss of funding. Simply stated, keeping students in the program is more profitable than getting them out.

Recommended solution: Quite clearly, the solution is not to replace "entrance" funding with "exit" funding. Some balance in the funding equation between "entrance" and "exit" is advisable. The designation of schools with poor "exit" records as "program improvement" schools is a start, but more needs to be done.

Problem 2: Available funds are spread too thin by trying to give something to everyone. Districts with ten or more children below the poverty level qualify. This standard is far too lenient.

Recommended solution: Upgrade the standard. Focus on deep pockets of poverty (rather than on wrinkles of poverty). If political concerns for making funds available to all are central to the decision, then perhaps different funding formulae can be established for different concentrations of children who live in poverty.

Problem 3: In the Southeast, federal and state funding of compensatory education target primarily the same population of students with little if any coordination. In South Carolina, federal funds are based primarily on poverty, secondarily on achievement. State funds are based exclusively on achievement. However, because of the relatively strong correlation between poverty and achievement, many of the same students qualify for both programs.

Recommended solution: A systematic study of the use of federal and state funds for the provision of compensatory education is sorely needed. The study would focus on the way in which decisions concerning the use of funds are made, the basis for the decisions (whether opinion or evidence), and the impact of those decisions on the number of qualified students who receive compensatory education services.

Problem 4: Achievement standards used to judge program effectiveness are far too low. States are using normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains of 0 or 1 to judge the effectiveness of their compensatory education programs. An NCE gain of 0 means that the average student is performing on a test as well as the student would be expected to perform on the test, given his or her prior test performance and assuming that he or she was enrolled in the regular school program. Why should we pay additional money for students to do as well as they were expected to do if we left them alone?

(In this regard, an NCE gain of 1 translates into a raw score gain of about one-half an item beyond the level of achievement expected.)

Recommended solution: Substantially raise the standards. Studies of standards that enable students to return to and remain in the regular school program should be conducted. Data other than those obtained from standardized achievement tests (e.g., portfolios, teacher judgment) can also be used in making an informed decision in this regard.

Problem 5: Compensatory programs operate in isolation from other programs within a school. In our studies in South Carolina, we have identified three types of isolation: physical, emotional, and social. Physical isolation occurs, for example, when compensatory classrooms are housed in trailers located far away from the school. Emotional isolation occurs, for example, when students who are pulled out of regular classrooms feel stigmatized, rather than "special." Social isolation occurs when compensatory teachers and aides feel that they are not a part of the larger school community.

Recommended solution: Quite clearly, the schoolwide projects attempt to deal with all three types of isolation. I would encourage the continuation and expansion of these projects. Solutions in schools lacking schoolwide projects may include the establishment of (1) a communication network between regular and special teachers and (2) a leadership team (including administrators, regular classroom teachers, and special teachers) for overseeing and assuming responsibility for improving the quality of the compensatory program.

Problem 6: The curricular and instructional demands placed on students are so low that even those who are "successful" in the program are unlikely to succeed in the regular classroom if and when they return. Data collected throughout the country suggest that (1) the pacing of the instruction given to compensatory students is very slow, (2) compensatory teachers tend to teach at instructional level (where they believe students are at the present time) rather than grade level (where they believe students need to be in order to perform well on tests and succeed at the next grade level), and (3) the assignments given to compensatory students, particularly in higher grades, are even below the instructional level.

Recommended solution: The pace of instruction should be increased dramatically by determining desired learning outcomes and moving students forward when these outcomes have been achieved. For example, if the desired learning outcome in mathematics is mastery of the multiplication algorithm, then students who consistently are able to multiply a three-digit by a two-digit number have mastered the algorithm. Adding more digits to the two numbers being multipled adds nothing to our understanding of the student's mastery of the multiplication algorithm and increases the likelihood of computational errors.

Similarly, assignments should be given at grade level only. Using diagnostic-prescriptive teaching strategies, remedial instruction can be provided when students have difficulty mastering these grade-level assignments.

Problem 7: Attempts to improve the quality of compensatory education programs are based on the adoption of specific programs to meet specific needs, rather than on a systemic change in our thinking about the changes necessary for substantial, meaningful, and long-lasting improvement.

Programs such as Reading Recovery, Success for All, Computer Curriculum Corporation Laboratories, Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), and Assertive Discipline are touted and adopted by schools independent of their appropriateness in terms of the overall philosophy, instructional program, and available funding. As a consequence, the approach to improvement is typically piecemeal. School-level concerns are rarely, if ever, addressed.

Recommended solution: Schools should be required to submit a comprehensive strategic plan for improving compensatory education. In addition, people responsible for carrying out various components of the plan should be identified and held accountable.

Problem 8: Improvement should emphasize things that make a difference, rather than things that are easy to monitor. Chapter 1 has a long history of "bean counting." How many students are served? Are the right students served? Is purchased equipment used only for Chapter 1 students? How many minutes are students receiving Chapter 1 services? What delivery model (floating aide, pullout, after school) is being used? These questions, while easily addressed, are superficial.

Recommended solution: Raise fundamental questions that encourage or force administrators and teachers to look critically at their compensatory education program. Examples would include: Who is responsible for the success of the program at the school level? How should the program be staffed? If paraprofessionals are used to staff the program, what are their qualifications and training? What curricular and instructional demands are placed on students in the program? Are these demands consistent with the goal of helping students return to and remain in the regular school program? What is being done in the classroom to ensure student involvement and success?

CHARLES S. BENSON
Director, National Center for Research in Vocational Education
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California

I have not in recent years had close contact with Chapter 1 activities, so please recognize that the evidence on which I base these comments is quite limited. In my view, the typical Chapter 1 program, if there is such a thing, has the following major deficiencies:

- The objectives are too narrow and too limited ("improvement in basic skills"). The underlying assumption appears to be that Chapter 1 students can't be expected to learn much beyond low-level literacy.
- Pullout programs label and isolate students without offering much in the way of compensatory benefits to those students.
- The methods of instruction in Chapter 1 programs are intellectually barren, and they are boring to students and teachers alike.
- Relatively speaking, Chapter 1 funds are concentrated excessively in the elementary grades.

Successful school programs help people become successful workers. Successful workers, other things equal, are self-reliant, and they hold a favorable view of what they are doing with their lives. Even when a Chapter 1 program manages to raise a graduate's level of basic skills to the point where he or she can get a job, the likely low quality of that job is vulnerable in today's economy to automation or export, and it probably pays a wage insufficient to maintain a decent standard of living.

When Chapter 1 was started, the claim was made that the program would break the cycle of poverty. That should have been easier to do in the 1960s economy than now, for now our Chapter 1 graduates have to compete for productivity with the best secondary graduates in countries like Malaysia and Indonesia. So I suggest that Chapter 1, as presently conducted, has become obsolete.

What might be done? I think the reauthorized legislation should be based on the assumption that low-income children can acquire at least as much in the way of knowledge and skills as children of middle-income parents. (Indeed, if low-income children were properly set on the path to learning, they might have greater motivation than middle-class youth to excel, thus to escape the poverty into which they were born.) It would also be important to try to get the teachers' unions, national, state, and local, to buy into the new assumption.

How, then, to translate the assumption into reality? Chapter 1 may be paying too little attention at the elementary level to recent developments in curricula and also (very important) to changes in teaching practices. There are new materials and new practices in teaching reading and writing. The learning of mathematical ideas (thinking like a mathematician) is approached through contextualized teaching and learning. There is renewed emphasis on cooperative learning.

Much in these new developments has been evaluated favorably. An interesting research project might be to see to what degree classrooms attended by low-income students have adopted these new, and apparently more powerful, pedagogical approaches.

I suspect that classrooms serving low-income students are mainly practicing skills and drills. If that is the case, the reauthorized legislation might seek to create a more intellectually vital educational environment for low-income students. I think this would mean a whole-school approach, and I think that is the right way to go.

As I wrote above, I believe that Chapter 1 funds are concentrated excessively on in-school remedial work in the elementary grades. I have been the principal investigator on a major study relating the learning of students to their nutritional status, and I am convinced that an appropriate use of Chapter 1 funds would be to undergird the nutritional well-being of low-income students. I believe the same about early childhood programs and even day care, provided the children are read to and given intellectually interesting toys, appropriate to their ages, to play with.

In middle schools, there is some evidence in this country and abroad that low-income children benefit when the context of contextualized teaching shifts, at least in some degree, toward economics and the nature of work in all its variety and technology, with the latter meaning helping students explore questions about "how things work." (This differs completely from the odd class session on "career orientation" and the random school journey to a workplace.) Insofar as these emphases required additional resources, I believe that the resources could legitimately be Chapter 1 grants.

As for secondary schools, there is now a whole set of reform proposals for restructuring around integration of academic and applied studies, cooperative learning, and a career identity, or industrial connection, for each institution. The latter, the industrial connection, facilitates the integration of education and work and helps students understand the significance of learning for their future careers. I would hold that some of the costs of secondary restructuring could well be met by Chapter 1.

GERALD W. BRACEY
Consultant
Alexandria, Virginia

Although I have not been systematically involved in Chapter 1 during the past six years, I believe that people in Chapter 1 sites are confused as to whether the program is remedial or preventive. Some separation of roles and concomitant strategies should be made.

Criteria for evaluating success in Chapter 1 have loosened in recent years and should continue to do so. We have evidence, sometimes dramatic, that emphasis on standardized tests leads to false hopes of achievement gains. The gains are limited to the tests used, and the skills do not generalize. This year, for example, when new tests were introduced in Maryland, scores fell in all districts, but those in Prince George's County, which had put a premium on high test scores, plummeted. Minority students lost 20-35 percentile ranks.

When evaluation techniques are not commensurate with instructional methods, teachers become demoralized. Some teachers with "whole-language" approaches to beginning reading are frustrated at being evaluated in terms of normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains on tests they feel are not valid.

The system needs to ensure that Chapter 1 instruction actually supplements and reinforces instruction in the regular classroom. I have seen classroom teachers tell Chapter 1 teachers that Johnny needs practice on certain skills and then observed those skills being taught in a discrete, decontextualized way that might have left the children confused about the goals of the process. No doubt the Chapter 1 teacher thought she was doing what was asked of her.

What *are* children told about the purpose of Chapter 1? In Cherry Creek, we had a non-Chapter 1 remedial reading program that said, in essence, "reading is easy for most people, but not for all. It's hard for you, and we know it, so we're going to give you extra help. We'll even do some of the exercises with you." When I interviewed children in this program, they seemed to understand it and not be bothered by any social stigma from getting yanked from their regular classroom, although several did object to missing science or some other favorite topic while in remediation. Pullout programs may not hurt children if the child is given a clear idea and rationale about what he's being pulled out to and why.

I have heard success tales from different models around the country, most recently from Elfrieda Hiebert at the University of Colorado. Is there any place where such reports are collected and/or disseminated? Even given the nonportability problem in education, there should be resources disseminated about successful outcomes.

JERE BROPHY
Co-Director, Institute for Research on Teaching
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

As a member of the independent review panel for the national assessment of Chapter 1, I have had occasion to hear a great deal of testimony and do a great deal of thinking about the program in the last couple of years. In a recent exercise in which review panel members were asked to list five things that they would keep the same about Chapter 1 and five things that they would change, I listed the following as features that I would like to maintain:

- Targeting of the program for poor students, with accountability requirements and rules designed to prevent abuse (but with greater flexibility at the local level for using funds in ways that make sense, given the goals of the program and the local situation).
- Spending most of the money on instructional personnel (teachers, aides) rather than on computers or other supplies and equipment.
- An emphasis on improving performance in higher-order thinking aspects of subjects, not just lower-order aspects.
- Targeting low-performing schools as in need of improvement (but on the basis of better measures and with follow-up that would include at least a three-year sustained and intensive in-service education program).
- Continued emphasis on parent involvement and other family outreach activities (improved along the lines suggested by Reg Clark and others).

I listed the following as the five most important changes I would like to see made in the way the program is run:

- In defining eligibility and targeting schools, put more emphasis on concentration formulas that would restrict the use of Chapter 1 funds to schools with high concentrations of poor students.
- Use ideas expressed by Slavin and Madden, Frechtling, Allington and McGill-Franzen, and others to replace the current narrow focus on standardized tests with a broader range of indicators (percentage of students in grade, retention rates at the high school level, percentage of students not listed as special in any way, progress made across several consecutive years, etc.). Reform the assessment system in ways that would cause it to promote the intended goals and to avoid unintended counterproductive consequences.
- Shift the rules (or publicize unrealized allowances in existing rules) in ways that would encourage schools to minimize pullout instruction and maximize improvements in what Chapter 1 students experience in regular classrooms (through schoolwide programs, reductions in class size, use of aides or teaching specialists who would work collaboratively with regular classroom teachers right in the regular classroom, etc.).

- More and better teacher training and provision of resources such as handbooks and videos, both in general and especially in schools targeted for improvement. Focus these on rich descriptions of best practice, organized as coherent depictions of systematic models, rather than on disconnected "what works" statements or presentations of techniques isolated from the rest of the program.
- In general, and increasingly with grade level, look at the whole curriculum, not just at language arts and mathematics. See that students progress in science and social studies, too, and that significant percentages of their reading and writing activities focus on substantive content in these areas.

JAMES P. COMER, M.D.

Maurice Falk Professor of Child Psychiatry
Child Study Center, Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Chapter 1 is the oldest and greatest source of public funding for education, yet there remains imprecise knowledge of who is served and under what conditions the services are provided. As reported by the Education Funding Research Center (1989), significant variability exists in the program's application among local education agencies. Further, measurable student outcomes and the overall effectiveness of the program are unclear.

Historically, Chapter 1 has been a reference point for other federal responses to modes and methods for compensatory education (for example, bilingual, vocational, and special education programs). Funding formulas have matched a discrete need with a discrete criterion for response to the stated need. Driven by the discrete, categorical structure of funding compensatory education for our nation, school districts have created separate systems within their educational system. A student's identified needs are treated separately, matching each need to its discrete funding source and requirements.

The current design for categorical aid allows for compartmentalized, differentiated approaches to educating the economically and educationally disadvantaged children of our nation. Socioeconomic status and educational need are closely entwined; often the Chapter 1 population is eligible for other types of categorical aid, such as bilingual services, special education, etc.

These discrete categories of aid intended to compensate for educational deficiencies have resulted in a deficit-based approach to educating a significant segment of society. That is, since funding is provided for a specific deficiency or need, the instruction is narrowly geared and insulates the identified deficit or need. This construct does not address learning as a multidimensional process. It fails to view education of the child in a holistic manner, therefore failing the whole child.

The lack of a systemic integrated approach to categorical aid and the great variability in program designs among school districts result in lost opportunities to comprehensively meet the needs of disadvantaged, academically needy students. Currently, a disadvantaged student who presents a specific need (for example, delayed cognitive skills) may receive separately driven services from Chapter 1, bilingual, and special education to meet the identified need. These services are not usually coordinated. Instead, the student is often pulled out of the classroom for individual or small group remediation. The compensatory activities are not assured to complement each other. Thus, the student with the most need may receive the most fragmented instruction.

Academic growth cannot occur in a vacuum, through isolated, discrete services. All sources of categorical aid must be congruous to the psychosocial as well as the academic needs. All aspects of child development must be considered and addressed.

Academic growth is inextricably bound to personal and social growth. Therefore, the need arises to reconfigure:

- Resources—human and material available through categorical aid that serves the whole child.
- Delivery system—how the resources are applied.

RECONFIGURATION OF RESOURCES

A quarter of a century ago, Chapter 1 was implemented, without predisposing research, as a primary vehicle to win the War on Poverty (Stringfield, Billig, and Davis, 1991). Chapter 1 became the template for administration of further categorical aid—moneys matched with identified need.

Since Chapter 1 was initiated, there have been consistent and significant changes in the needs of school-age children. Categorical aid to bilingual and special education emerged to address some of the changes. The major factors over the last decade that have negatively affected the conditions and expectations of disadvantaged school-age children and those who educate them, and what is needed to alleviate these negative factors, are listed below.

First, there has been a consistent rise in the numbers of disadvantaged children living in poverty with single parent families who are undereducated. These factors are often interwoven (Wright-Edelman, 1987).

- ***There is a need to design comprehensive educational programs that help students overcome these conditions by providing an outcomes-based structure that attends to the development of the whole child.***

Second, there has been a consistent increase of immigrant students. The number of newly arrived immigrants of school age is currently at its highest since the turn of the century. The majority of students attending public schools in major urban cities are culturally diverse. By 2020, school populations are projected to have 17.5 percent limited-English-proficient students (Pallas, Natriello, and McDill, 1989). Over time, school practices have not remained consistent with the diverse needs of the student population.

- ***There is a need to fully align the design of Chapter 1 and other entitlement services with the diversity of the student population.***

Third, many students in special education are disadvantaged. Through entitlement programs, these students receive overlapping services from Chapter 1, immigrant, and bilingual education programs. There are "uncertainties about where to place students." What students in these programs often have in common is low academic achievement (H. Walberg, 1987).

- ***There is a need to identify the specific needs of disadvantaged students and remove the compartmentalized and discrete delivery of services to this population that impinge upon student achievement.***

Fourth, general education (which administers Chapter 1) and special education are a dual system. The latter operates within the former. Competition and unnecessary duplication between the two are fueled by their separate average per pupil expenditure funding formulas (Stainback and Stainback, 1984).

- ***There is a need to remove competition and duplicity in services to disadvantaged students and to fully coordinate services.***

Fifth, a differentiated pedagogical culture among teachers has been created by the discrete separate application of Chapter 1. For example, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) in New York City has had differentiated working conditions for some Chapter 1 teachers. Generally, these conditions are more favorable than those of non-Chapter 1 teachers. In view of the size of the target population and the fiscal impact Chapter 1 has had on education over time, a "Chapter 1 culture" exists, especially in poor urban areas. Although funding may now continue for two years after meeting improvement criteria, there must be a change process to reconceptualize the "penalty for success" syndrome in Chapter 1 and establish incentives for teachers that promote success without consideration of job loss.

- ***There is a need to restructure the application of Chapter 1 by removing any direct or indirect inducements that perpetuate failure of disadvantaged students.***

Sixth, the "Chapter 1 culture" has facilitated the use of instructional materials specifically geared to the eligible students. These materials have been designed to be individually driven by the student with drill-and-practice activities, for example, self-correcting kits that allow each child to work on a concept individually in a pullout program. Ofttimes these materials focus on discrete skills without integrating the range of hierarchial cognitive skills necessary to generalize information for broad application.

- ***There is a need to assure that Chapter 1 curriculum and instructional materials promote desired student outcomes parallel to those on their nondisadvantaged counterparts.***

Seventh, teaching skills and materials are often underutilized at sites where the various categorical programs are discretely applied. Ofttimes the use of designated Chapter 1 staff and materials is limited to specific pullout time. Under current program conditions, even with a 75 percent or more Chapter 1-eligible student body, staff and materials may remain untouched when not used by targeted Chapter 1 staff and students.

- ***There is a need for assurances of maximum measurable efficiency and effective use of Chapter 1 human and material resources schoolwide.***

The closed, discrete manner in which categorical aid programs have been conducted has not generally fostered parental involvement. The construct of special education, bilingual, immigrant, and Chapter 1 programs all indicate involvement by parents, but these programs are not assured to be integrated into school life. Historically, the teacher pulls out the targeted students for discretely timed periods without a mandate to integrate parent participation in the child's school life as a variable for student progress. In view of our pluralistic society and the varied and intensive needs of disadvantaged students, there must be a mandatory understanding of home-school differences and expectations.

- ***There is a need to hold all schools accountable for integrating a parent involvement component into Chapter 1 programming, including documented outcomes.***

REDESIGN OF THE SERVICE DELIVERY SYSTEM

The constituents in the schooling process are inevitably bonded (students, parents, teachers, support staff, and administrators). Their roles and responsibilities affect the outcome—viable productive citizens. The redesign of Chapter 1 and other compensatory education funded programs must configure a comprehensive school development plan (CSDP) that employs all constituents of the schooling process who have a vested interest in student performance. A CSDP must include the following mechanisms (Comer, 1988, and Gursky, 1990):

- Site-based management and governance team.
- Multiservice support team.
- Parent involvement team.

Site-Based Management and Governance Team

This component develops the CSDP. It coordinates and facilitates the application of all compensatory programs in a cohesive manner. This delivery system of multiservice compensatory education will eliminate competitiveness, redundancy, fragmentation, and compartmentalization of education services to the disadvantaged. The team is responsible for delivery of instruction, staff development, and ongoing assessment of the entire schooling process at the site.

The planning team will comply with all funding requirements of each compensatory program. The separate delivery of individual services will be replaced by pooling the attributes of each funded program, permitting the CSDP components to mold comprehensive, integrated responses to students' needs.

An example of a coordinated CSDP comprehensive response to categorical aid: special education (prereferral mandate), Chapter 1 (disadvantaged low achiever), bilingual (limited English proficiency), and dropout prevention (support to the student and outreach to parent). These separate sources of funding may be coordinated to serve the whole child by establishing a two-pronged remediation CSDP plan:

- The site-based management team designs a plan that provides academic remediation to this bilingual, low achiever targeted for special education referral. The plan requires Chapter 1 and learning disability specialists to collaboratively identify the student's needs and to remediate.
- The multiservice (psychosocial) team provides strategies for parent and child to acclimate and adjust to the new culture and improve language proficiency while providing guidance to improve school attendance. Similarly, all responses to the needs of disadvantaged students will be guided by an intention to use all eligible categorical aid in a coordinated manner to maximize benefit to the whole child.

There is a particular need to solidify staff development practices that assure best practices for disadvantaged low-income students. The National Center for Education Statistics (1985) states that more than 14 percent of all new teachers hired in major city districts since 1983 are uncertified in their primary area of instruction. This number is twice as high as in other districts. Further, low-income students have less contact with the best-qualified teachers (Oakes, 1987). The management team establishes approaches that create a faculty who is qualified and committed to enabling disadvantaged low achievers to maximize their abilities.

Multiservice Support Team

This component may include support staff (psychologist, social worker, guidance counselor, special educator). Members may be funded by any of the compensatory programs, but work as complementary team members. Since student academic learning is entwined with personal and social growth, this component of the CSDP is essential to improved student behavior and school climate. Variables that affect student performance are identified and then intervention provided to remedy causes. For example, students are taught self-monitoring skills, problem-solving skills, and understanding and managing mainstream values. Labeling the child is not a prerequisite to providing such services. By attending to the psychosocial needs, this team provides the socially and economically disadvantaged students with strategies that allow them to maximize academic opportunities.

Parent Involvement

"A child's experiences at home and those in school deeply affect the child's psychological development, and this in turn shapes academic achievement" (Comer, 1988). Direct and entrenched parent participation is a most viable element for home-school understanding and responsiveness to the student's needs. Parents will participate in school governance.

All compensatory education programs recommend parental involvement. This CSDP body will serve as a common thread to unify parent-involvement activities. The approach prevents parents from being "pulled in many directions" by discrete activities provided to comply with funded program requirements. Emphasis and coordinated parent activities will be based on needs particular to the site. For example, adult education, limited-English-proficiency training, communication skills, due process rights, etc., will be projected and planned cohesively.

The redesign of Chapter 1 service delivery systems includes other compensatory education programs in its configuration. Mindful of the best and worst documented practices gathered since the recent emphasis on school reform, application of this design reflects the best practices of effective teaching.

This redesign for a comprehensive school plan reflects the innovative subsets proposed in the last reauthorization of Chapter 1 (secondary and schoolwide projects, early childhood Even Start). These approaches to educating disadvantaged students are presented in a cohesive manner that focuses on the development of the whole child. "It is in and through education that a culture and polity not only tries to perpetuate, but enacts, the kinds of thinking it welcomes" (Minnich, 1990).

ROBERT D. CRANGLE

Attorney-at-Law, Law Offices of Metz and Crangle
Lincoln, Kansas

First of all, let me state my biases and qualifications for the record. I live in an economically depressed area where a third of the population is over the age of 62 and a very high percentage of the population is low income. I live in Lincoln County, Kansas, an area of 720 square miles and 3600 people. The eastern 60 percent of the county is mostly served by one public school district; the western 40 percent is mostly served by a second. Most schoolchildren ride a bus. At the extreme, grade-school children now have an hour-long, one-way bus ride to and from their attendance centers. Last week the Kansas legislature and governor agreed on a state equalized basic funding formula for all school districts in Kansas.

For several years I was a member of an elected K-8 school board north of Chicago (Lake Bluff, Illinois). My nine children (now 4 to 22) have the full range of academic talents, skills, and interests. My wife and I have been foster parents to children from low-income families in both Massachusetts and in Illinois.

Given my personal background, I believe that:

- ***Isolated education programs work poorly.***

As long as Chapter 1 resources are conceived and budgeted in isolation from categorical aid programs, they will not get their intended job done very well. What is done will be done inefficiently.

- ***The key to success is attendance-center leadership and morale.***

Unless the principal is able and willing to assert leadership that unifies Chapter 1 resources with all the other programs, students, and teachers in her or his building, the incremental impact of Chapter 1 funds on results, especially for systems moving to results-based outcome measurement, will be unimpressive.

- ***Lay school board members and candidates need training.***

Most school board members are confused about Chapter 1. To measure Chapter 1 purely by money is to not understand the intent of the legislation. To view Chapter 1 as an isolated program is irritating to a school board member who sees problems as a whole and does not see problems which should be attacked "slice by slice" from different pots of money or different sets of good intentions. It would be useful to have an intensive indoctrination program that would bring experienced and new school board members into full and complete understanding of how Chapter 1 is supposed to work, how it is supposed to interact with other programs, and its limitations.

- ***Poor children need to learn about "making it" both where they are* and *in a larger world.***

The attendance center is often also the social center for a community. Sports, musical events, and other school-centered activities provide community norm building.

as well as a means for the children to gain increased self-esteem and positive reinforcement. Poor children also need to learn how the rest of the world operates and how to join the nonimpoverished outside world that seems to control so much of the life of their local community. Chapter 1 should be reviewed in part for its ability to increase a poor child's knowledge, skills, and abilities needed both within the community, in case he or she stays, and for the outside world, in case she or he chooses to leave.

- ***The program puts too much emphasis on accountability.***

There is a cruel conflict between maintaining accountability of federal (or state and local) taxpayer funding on the one hand, and maintaining flexibility to meet local needs on the other. Many learning and emotional issues of children are the same in all districts, but spatial and community realities require similar needs to be met in different ways in different places. There are programming consequences when your rural attendance center is bringing in students from hundreds of square miles everyday, or when an urban attendance center is in the middle of a combat zone, or when the students lack extended families able to provide flexible arrangements.

Most, if not all, of the primary care-givers of poor children are working in jobs which have limited flexibility, or are looking for work, or cannot provide discretionary transportation to and from the school, or are themselves incapacitated physically, emotionally, or by attitude. Excessive accountability-based paperwork can work against addressing the realities of different communities, school districts, school buildings, and family structures.

- ***Chapter 1 preceded educational telecommunications.***

The decreasing costs of telecommunications, hypertext, compact disc players, microcomputers, and video are transforming the educational landscape. It is now possible to bring a richness and diversity of high-quality educational programming to every school, including those with lots of poor children.

CHRISTOPHER T. CROSS

Executive Director, Education Initiative
The Business Roundtable
Washington, D.C.

Since 1965, when Chapter 1 (then Title I) was first enacted, the education field has changed so much that one should ask: What would we do differently today if we were trying to achieve the goals of Chapter 1? I would suggest that we would *not* enact a program that looks like Chapter 1 does, now in its third decade of service. Should we not take this opportunity, the reauthorization of ESEA, to be bold and creative, casting aside the shackles of habit and time? Congress can lead in reconceptualizing elementary and secondary education programs.

RECONCEPTUALIZING CHAPTER 1

Since 1965, we have demonstrated that we can bring most children up to a minimum level of literacy. Data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and other sources attest to that very important accomplishment. Today, however, we must move beyond simply literacy to prepare students for a much more demanding world—one in which they are pitted for jobs and survival against children in Taiwan, Seoul, and Yokohama just as surely as they are against kids in Western High and P.S. 99.

What do we need to do differently?

We need to step back from the profusion of federal programs aimed at helping poor and/or underachieving children (Title I, bilingual education, special education, etc.) and realize that children do not come with labels. Too often we try to meet the needs of a child and find out that the narrow confines of program law, rules, and regulations simply do not permit the proper range of services to be provided to that child. (One of the many ironies we face is that often there are no real obstacles to some services, but the culture and folklore that have grown around these programs serve as highly effective barriers to meeting children's complete needs.)

And, often, the needs of children are not confined to those services that can be provided by the schools, such as after-school care programs, parent counseling, and health and dental care.

Why not permit schools to pool the funds they receive from all federal programs aimed at poor, disabled, limited-English, and underachieving children? Children could be served as whole beings who have certain needs, not as objects that wear labels and get placed in pigeonholes which must correspond to federal law, while their needs go unserved. The major requirement placed on schools would be that student performance must improve, and it would be up to a school team, which could hire advisers, to determine how best to achieve that goal. (States would also need to adopt similar changes with respect to their own programs that aid at-risk students.)

If, after a reasonable time (say, three years), children in that school were not doing better, then either the state or local education agency would send in a team of experts to redesign the program. If the school continued to show no progress, then the LEA or SEA would replace the team. On the other hand, success above a predetermined level of expectation would be rewarded, with rewards accruing to the benefit of the school team.

What is important to note here is that children would not be penalized by money being removed from the school. The penalty would be against the adults who had literally failed the children. Conversely, success would bring greater learning to the children and professional rewards to the adults.

COMBINING SCHOOL, HEALTH, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Further, one might conceive of an option that would also permit a portion of the pool of federal education funds to be commingled with social and health service funds if the school team determined that this was necessary to meet the needs of particular children. Funding from other programs/agencies would be used to match any education dollars so that education funding could not be used to substitute for other budgets. Rather, the education money would serve as the catalyst or magnet to ensure that other essential educational needs of children were served.

One of the great dilemmas in formulating a plan like this would be how one effectively meets the needs of children with disabilities and children without disabilities.

One needs to remember that the majority of children served by special education have learning disabilities which are often very similar to the characteristics of poor and non-English-speaking children. The tough, emotional part comes when one considers the needs of children with severe physical impairments. Clearly, some special provision may need to be made for those children, both to be certain that these needs are met and that their needs do not absorb all of the funds available.

Since the mid-1960s, we have been caught in a cycle of reauthorizing various major programs in a clockwork fashion that guarantees that Congress and the executive never examine all of the programs serving K through 12 at one time. Postsecondary education (at least as it affects Department of Education programs), on the other hand, is always handled as a unit.

Over time, the result has been that Congress has created separate subcommittees with jealously guarded jurisdictional lines that ensure that one set of lawmakers is unable to move beyond those narrow confines. Similarly, the federal executive branch, state education agencies, local school districts, and even individual schools have come to reflect those divisions.

We have federal offices for compensatory, bilingual, vocational, and special education, to say nothing of gifted, math and science, health education, and a score of others. It is not surprising that states and local districts have almost identical structures. Each is charged with seeing to the partial needs of a child. Not one single office is charged with integrating programs or with seeing that the total needs of children are met.

In the House of Representatives, the Select Education Subcommittee is responsible for all programs dealing with education for children with disabilities and special needs. That committee enacted new legislation in 1991 that will not expire until 1996. However, in 1993 or 1994, the House Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education will have before it for reauthorization all of the titles and programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That process will occur two years after that subcommittee last reauthorized the vocational education programs. In the Senate, the pattern is quite similar.

A NEW APPROACH TO LEGISLATION

One can now argue, as many will, that the work load of the Congress will not permit the consideration of all these related programs at one time. Someone else might argue, however, that the rationalization of programs to educate America's children is simply too important for Congress *not* to expend the time and energy to do the kind of review and reauthorization that would be required.

The time has come to reform the process by which we make law, oversee implementation and policymaking, and provide services. It should start with the Congress tearing down its own Berlin Walls and merging, at least for this purpose, the subcommittees that will hold the hearings and write the laws. In fact, one could even make the case for Congress creating—for one term—a Joint Committee of the House and Senate with legislative authority that would bring the House and Senate together with the kind of urgency and commitment which the national crisis in our schools deserves.

After all, the job is so large, the needs so great, and the potential benefit so enormous that abandoning custom and bruising a few egos is worth the reward. And, with hard work and good luck, the result will be a system that meets the needs of children.

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND
Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York

OVERVIEW

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (now Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981) has sought to close the gaps between the educational haves and have-nots, to pursue equity in education by buttressing basic skills instruction for low-income and low-achieving students. Current efforts to restructure schools incorporate these aims but extend them much further, to ensure that all children learn more deeply about more complex matters in more effective ways—ways that will enable them to meet the demands of a twenty-first century society and workplace in which they will need to be able to analyze, adapt, invent, cooperate, and solve problems, as well as decode and compute.

These demands require major changes in how teaching and learning are managed and assessed, how teachers are prepared and supported, and how schools are organized and run. In brief, they require classrooms that support active learning and interdisciplinary problem solving at high levels of performance. They require schools that support personalized structures for student-adult engagement, schools that ensure attention to students' individual needs (Lieberman, Darling-Hammond, and Zuckerman, 1991; Elmore, 1990; Sizer, 1984). These demands also require some rethinking of Chapter 1 in at least the following five areas:

- Possibilities and incentives for addressing the "whole school" and the "whole child"
- Strategies for achieving greater equity in the allocation of resources to schools serving poor children
- Approaches to preparing and supporting teachers and other school professionals
- New models for evaluating programs in line with current understandings of teaching, learning, and assessment
- Assessment of proposals to motivate school improvement.

Over the past quarter-century, Chapter 1 has, in many respects, served the nation—and the children who are its direct beneficiaries—well. It created a focus on the needs of low-income and low-achieving children, helped to equalize spending, legitimized parent involvement, and probably helped to narrow the gap in basic skills achievement between majority and minority students.

Yet some regulations and auditing practices associated with Chapter 1 and other federal categorical programs have encouraged the bureaucratization and compartmentalization of schools. Chapter 1 audit requirements to show that funds "supplement" without "supplanting" normal school expenditures on individual children have led to the widespread use of pullout programs. Across federal categorical programs, the need to categorize children according to various eligibility criteria has often led to segregating or stigmatizing approaches to service delivery, as well as to fragmentation of services that are funded by separate programs through separate offices using separate funding channels. The bureaucratic program structures created by auditing, monitoring, and reporting requirements have fragmented the time and efforts of school people and children and have deflected resources for more effective instruction (Kimbrough and Hill, 1981; Soo Hoo, 1990; Klugman, Carter, and Israel, 1979).

In addition, evaluation requirements tied to norm-referenced standardized testing for Chapter 1 have created pressures to "teach to tests" that exert low-level cognitive demands, thus undermining more effective teaching techniques (Darling-Hammond, 1991). Inequalities in access to curriculum and teaching resources within as well as across schools further limit the academic opportunities of Chapter 1's intended beneficiaries (Oakes, 1985; Darling-Hammond, 1990).

SERVING THE WHOLE CHILD IN AN IMPROVED SCHOOL SETTING

Schoolwide Chapter 1 projects have been noticeably successful in improving teaching, learning, and child services for all students in schools in Philadelphia, New York, and other cities. Principals of schools that have launched schoolwide projects have noted that they are able to serve more students more effectively, to reduce class size and use staff more flexibly, to improve scheduling and coordination of services, to make more resources available to students, and to support professional development and different teaching strategies (Schenck, in U.S. Department of Education, 1992).

Chapter 1's schoolwide project initiative should be strengthened and expanded. Eligibility rules should allow more schools access to whole-school project options with necessary safeguards and supports for careful planning and appropriate services. In addition, more "high-impact" schools should be allowed and encouraged to combine funding from several federal programs, again with appropriate safeguards and planning, so that disadvantaged students can be better taught in more personalized fashion throughout the day, rather than shuffled from one fragmented pullout class to another. Finally, initiatives to enhance the capacity of schools to combine funding for education, health, and social welfare services for children so as to provide an integrated, workable safety net for children should be aggressively pursued in Chapter 1 and other federal categorical programs.

Among the strategies that should be encouraged are intensive staff development programs linked to school improvement initiatives. Also important is the reallocation of professional personnel so that they may work intensively with students for longer periods of time and over multiple years, rather than in compartmentalized programs that split students' time among many adults, none of whom can come to know the child well.

In U.S. schools, only 50 percent of professional staff are classroom teachers; the remainder work in specialized offices and roles that serve children at the periphery of the classroom. As a consequence, while staff/pupil ratios in most schools average around 1 to 12, class sizes remain more than twice as high. Students do not receive personalized attention because the organization of the school and the administration of programs focus on specialized divisions of labor rather than integrated attention to the whole child.

Regulatory strategies should be evaluated for the extent to which they enable schools to focus resources on students' needs within their core classrooms. Regulations should not be allowed to dilute resources into many different offices and bureaucracies that fragment students' and teachers' time and rarely address the root causes of classroom failure.

PURSUING GREATER EQUITY IN ACCESS TO EDUCATION

Despite some equalization spurred by Chapter 1's comparability requirements, there are still dramatic inequalities in education funding across states, among districts, and among schools within districts (ETS, 1991; Kozol, 1991). These inequalities, which manifest in unequal access to highly qualified teachers and high-quality curricula, routinely disadvantage students in low-income schools, especially those in central cities and poor rural areas.

As a consequence of these inequalities, students are at risk not only from poverty, but from the schools they attend. Chapter 1 will never effectively remedy underachievement as long as its services are layered on a system that so poorly educates low-income children to begin with. The schools serving large concentrations of Chapter 1 students are frequently inadequate, and many of their problems originate with district and state funding policies and staffing practices that place them at risk.

The recently released interim report of an independent commission on Chapter 1 observes that "given the inequitable distribution of state and local resources, the current notion that Chapter 1 provides supplemental aid to disadvantaged children added to a level playing field is a fiction" (Commission on Chapter 1, 1992, p. 4). The commission proposes that each state be held accountable for ensuring comparability in "vital services" among all its districts, as well as in all schools within each district.

The commission proposal should be seriously pursued in the reauthorization of Chapter 1. Among these vital services, perhaps the most important is highly qualified teachers, not just for specific Chapter 1 services, but for all classrooms.

Low-income students in many central city and poor rural schools are routinely taught by a disproportionate number of inexperienced and underprepared teachers, teachers teaching out of their fields of preparation, and short- and long-term substitutes hired when vacancies cannot be filled. Dramatic differences in salaries and working conditions across school districts explain much of the disparity in teacher supply and qualifications between cities and their generally wealthier suburbs.

In recent years, shortages of qualified teachers in subject areas like early childhood education, bilingual education, special education, mathematics, science, and foreign languages have forced cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Houston to hire thousands of teachers who are not fully prepared. The vast majority of these are assigned to the most disadvantaged central city schools, where working conditions are least attractive and turnover rates are highest (Darling-Hammond, 1990; 1992).

Furthermore, inexperienced and underprepared teachers are disproportionately assigned to teach the lowest-achieving students.

These circumstances have many unfortunate consequences for the children who are the intended beneficiaries of Chapter 1. In part as a function of the limited skills of their teachers (and in part due to the pressures exerted by standardized tests, discussed below), students placed in the lowest tracks or in remedial programs often work at a low cognitive level on rote tasks and worksheets that are profoundly disconnected from the skills they need to learn. Rarely are they given the opportunity to talk about what they know, to read real books, to construct and solve problems in mathematics or science (Oakes, 1985; Davis, 1986; Metz, 1978; Trimble and Sinclair, 1986; Cooper and Sherk, 1989). What these children learn differs from what students learn in upper tracks or in schools where good teaching is widespread.

Robert Dreeben (1987) describes the results of his study of reading instruction and outcomes for 300 black and white first graders in seven schools in the Chicago area. He found that differences in reading outcomes among students were almost entirely explained, not by socioeconomic status or race, but by the quality of instruction the students received.

Dreeben also found that the quality of instruction received by black students was, on average, much lower than that received by white students, thus creating a racial gap in aggregate achievement at the end of first grade. Other studies have also found that differences in school achievement are largely due to the effects of substantially different school opportunities between more- and less-advantaged students (Barr and Dreeben, 1983; Dreeben and Gamoran, 1986; Dreeben and Barr, 1987; Oakes, 1990).

The comparability requirements for Chapter 1 should take into account the extent to which states and school districts ensure that "vital services," including experienced, qualified teachers, challenging curriculum opportunities, and up-to-date curriculum materials and equipment are equally distributed among schools. In addition, teachers' knowledge of learning, child development, and teaching must be enhanced.

TEACHER PREPARATION AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Teacher preparation greatly affects teacher effectiveness, especially in school-based subjects, such as mathematics, science, and early reading (Darling-Hammond, 1992; Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik, 1985; Ashton and Crocker, 1986; Druva and Anderson, 1983). Teacher training also critically determines the use of teaching strategies to (1) encourage higher-order learning and (2) respond to students' needs and learning styles.

Significant funding should be provided through Chapter 1, perhaps as a proportion of state and local education agency grants, for staff development for teachers and administrators. Particularly in schools with high concentrations of Chapter 1 students (and other federal program students), funding should be used for schoolwide professional development programs that are aimed at improving teaching as a preventive to remediation.

In addition, funding strategies for targeted teacher preparation should be developed to ensure an adequate supply of qualified teachers to high-impact Chapter 1 schools. These strategies can borrow from the teacher preparation initiatives that accompanied the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) and those used by the Urban Teachers Corps during the 1970s to encourage recruits to teach in urban schools.

Funding strategies would include grants to teacher education programs, especially in urban areas, to prepare teachers in up-to-date methods for the new teaching, learning, and assessment demands posed by recent reforms. Such programs would also prepare teachers to understand the needs of at-risk learners. In addition, forgivable loan programs could be used to encourage recruits to engage in rigorous preparation and then commit to teaching in high-poverty urban and rural schools.

NEW EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND STANDARDS

Assessment in American schools must change fundamentally, according to a growing consensus among researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. Current testing fails to measure accurately what students know and can do. Moreover, current testing practices undermine instruction focused on the acquisition of higher-order thinking skills and complex performance abilities, contributing to an underachieving curriculum in American schools (McKnight et al., 1987; Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Madaus et al., 1992; National Research Council, 1982; Darling-Hammond, 1991).

The requirement that Chapter 1 programs be evaluated using nationally normed standardized tests has impeded state and local efforts to reform their assessment practices, and it should be revised. The requirement contributes to the overuse of such tests, especially with very young students, for whom they are least reliable and valid. Psychologists, testing experts, researchers, and early-childhood educators do not endorse the use of mass-administered multiple-choice standardized tests for placing students in programs or making summative judgments about their progress (NAEYC, 1988, 1991).

Many schools, districts, and states have recently begun to develop different forms of assessment for students. Vermont, California, Connecticut, Maryland, and New York are adopting approaches much like the assessment systems used in other countries. These include essay examinations, scientific experiments, and exhibitions in such areas as debating and the arts. They also include portfolios of students' work and projects that require analysis, investigation, experimentation, cooperation, and written, oral, or graphic presentation of findings. These assessments require students to think analytically and demonstrate their proficiency.

Such initiatives will falter or flourish depending on the directions taken by federal policymakers. Chapter 1 evaluation standards should not continue to require the use of testing instruments that exhibit limited validity and, by their influence on instruction, severely limit the learning experiences to which students are exposed. School districts and states should be encouraged to propose alternative forms of assessment that reliably assess students' performance capabilities, including performance tasks, evaluations of student work, and systematic teacher observations of students.

Schools and districts should be required to show that they have an assessment system for evaluating student progress and program accomplishments that

- Measures progress toward all program goals for students
- Represents real performance tasks and situations
- Measures higher-order skills and performance abilities
- Provides multiple methods and occasions for students to demonstrate their skills and knowledge, and multiple assessment strategies and measures
- Allows teachers to evaluate student growth longitudinally and cumulatively, using samples of work, observations, performance on tasks, etc.
- Allows assessment of student progress within programs using longitudinal gains on criterion-referenced measures for the individual students in the program.

The last of these criteria suggests an essential change in how programs are evaluated. As discussed below, current evaluations that look at program "effectiveness" using cross-sectional measures of norm-referenced achievement produce spurious results because their methods obscure both who and what is being measured. Program populations change from the time one set of average test scores is produced until the next; thus, a stable population is not being assessed, and gains and losses may be a function of changes in who is taking the test, rather than how individual students score. National program evaluations should be based on sampling studies better suited to research purposes.

INCENTIVES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

At least three aspects of Chapter 1 operations provide intended and unintended incentives influencing how schools serve their students:

- How funds are allocated to schools and students
- How programs are evaluated
- What efforts are made to encourage program improvement.

In its interim report, the National Assessment of Chapter 1 describes how schools whose students improve their performance may lose their Chapter 1 funds (U.S. Department of Education, 1992, p. 69). This disincentive arises from the requirement that districts allocate their Chapter 1 moneys according to both poverty and educational need. Obviously, when districts allocate funds based on the number of low-scoring students in each school, schools lose money as their students score higher. Thus, the incentives for schools to succeed in improving students' achievement are mixed, at best.

The most straightforward approach to remedying this disincentive, and arguably the one most faithful to the original intent of Title I, is to *allocate funds to schools strictly on the basis of the concentration of children in poverty, with even more emphasis than currently exists on targeting funds to schools with high concentrations of poverty.* This approach would ensure that schools serving low-income children could build a resource-rich environment for students who experience fewer material resources at home.

This solution seems to me much more reasonable than other current proposals to create a reward-and-sanction system of incentives for Chapter 1. The independent Commission on Chapter 1 (1992, p. 4), for example, proposes "an outcome-based system of accountability [that] will also form the basis for new plans of enforcement that utilize both incentives and sanctions." Such a system is certain to create other counterproductive disincentives of its own. Based on previous research on similar test-based incentives used by states and districts, we can expect to see efforts to manipulate student program populations as a means for controlling scores (for a review, see Darling-Hammond, 1991).

Equally important, such policies further exacerbate existing incentives for talented staff to seek schools where students are easy to teach and school stability is high. Thus, the policies further compromise the educational chances of disadvantaged students, who are already served by a disproportionate share of inexperienced, unprepared, and underqualified teachers (Oakes, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1990; 1992).

The penalization of schools ultimately penalizes the students who attend the schools. Whether the penalty is some form of probation or "deregistration" (that is, removal of state or professional approval to operate) or sanctions for staff individually or collectively, this approach to school improvement will make it even more difficult for the most troubled schools to recruit qualified staff. Promises of bonuses for "successful" schools, coupled with threats of penalties if scores decrease, will also reduce the likelihood that schools of choice will admit the most educationally needy Chapter 1 students.

A rewards-and-sanctions approach to accountability for Chapter 1 would almost certainly result in many low-scoring students being (1) inappropriately shifted to special education programs, (2) retained in grade so that their scores look better (a practice that has been shown to undermine both long-range achievement and graduation rates), and/or excluded from schools of choice. These results are predictable whether the measures are traditional standardized tests or new assessment measures and whether the statistic used is the percentage of students attaining a particular score or the presumed "gain" in performance for the aggregated scores of program students at two points in time.

A useful approach to Chapter 1 accountability would maintain the intentions of the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to stimulate program improvement with thoughtful diagnosis, staff development, and schoolwide change initiatives, but would rely on more careful methods of identifying schools for program improvement (as discussed above). Program improvement funds should be used to enable outside teams of expert reviewers to work with school staff in evaluating their practices and developing a plan. These funds would also support the schoolwide staff development needed to implement new, more effective practices.

Diagnosis should include assessment of district and state-imposed factors that may be undermining school performance, including the availability of resources and qualified personnel. Remedying such factors should be part of the district and state responsibility in overseeing and supporting the plan's implementation.

Chapter 1 can ensure that low-income children benefit from the efforts of the nation's school reform movement. This role will be strengthened as the program

- Continues and expands its emphasis on whole-school/whole-child approaches to education and related services
- Creates ways to equalize access to educational resources
- Extends its support for teacher and school learning and development
- Supports more sophisticated approaches to program evaluation and student assessment
- Develops strategies for school funding and school improvement that enhance school capacity rather than create counterproductive disincentives for serving educationally needy students well.

LaVAUN DENNETT

Consultant
Silver Spring, Maryland

Once upon a time, not so long ago, a group of children, teachers, administrators, parents, and community people in an urban school district got together to take a critical look at their school. There were things to admire:

- A dedicated staff
- Average or above-average test scores
- A clean, safe, orderly environment.

But there were also concerns:

- Students tracked into special education and Chapter 1 classes seldom (if ever) caught up with their peers, and expectations for their academic and behavioral standards were low.
- A disproportionate number of special education students were poor, were black, and were boys.
- Chapter 1 pullout classes served the same students year after year.
- Gifted students attended a special program in a separate building.
- There was little emphasis on creativity or problem-solving skills.
- Staff worked in isolated grade-level classes with little interaction with one another and little attention to improving their teaching skills or changing teaching strategies.

The group decided the school could do better. So they changed some things—nothing that hadn't been done before somewhere, but things that had never been done at this school. They

- Organized children in multiage groups in core classes with a teacher who became their advocate/counselor/coach
- Grouped students for reading/language arts and for math according to concepts students were working on, regardless of grade level or ability
- Organized teachers in teams around groups of students
- Organized the curriculum around themes and critical concepts
- Worked with the community to find resources to expand the availability and use of technology by students and by teachers
- Concentrated extensive staff development on expectations, beliefs, and attitudes; teaching strategies and techniques; and curriculum
- Changed the report card to a progress report with lots of comments and narrative from teachers

- Increased parental involvement by using parents and community members as teachers, mentors, curriculum designers, and partners in problem solving that would improve the school
- Reduced class size substantially by creating a flexible schedule that eliminated all pullout classes and made special-needs teachers part of a teaching team.

Amazing things began to happen. Test scores increased dramatically, while discipline problems decreased just as dramatically. Special Education and Chapter 1 students were integrated into all classes all day, and labels were removed. Students became teachers as well as learners, and teachers became learners as well as teachers. Staff members went into one another's rooms to share ideas, coach one another, and teach together.

Students, teachers, and parents began to support, challenge, and trust one another. A long waiting list of students hoping to move into the school was created. People from all over the country visited the school to learn from its example. Everyone began to experience the joy of learning together.

Even more amazing, however, the school's success became a barrier to continuing the program that worked so well. Chapter 1 scores rose so high the school could no longer qualify as a Chapter 1 school, and one teaching position was withdrawn. Special education students were no longer labeled, so the special education teacher was removed from the school. As at-risk students became successful, other resources previously available to them were also removed, including two more staff positions. In four years the school lost four staff positions that had been allocated according to formulas for special-needs programs.

SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

Our current system of allocating federal resources and designing complex rules and regulations for their use locks schools into practices that educators and policymakers alike consider ineffective. If schools redesign programs around the needs of students and best teaching practices, they must worry about being out of compliance. Schools and districts cannot afford to lose federal resources, especially in times of economic turmoil, but can they afford to continue systems that limit their ability to deliver quality services to students and communities?

Chapter 1 schoolwide projects are one attempt to provide flexibility at the school level. Schoolwide projects encourage innovation and school improvement and pull Chapter 1 staff into a collaborative relationship with teachers. The flexible use of resources and strategies eliminates some of the fragmentation and isolation experienced in many schools that receive resources from several different programs—all with different rules, regulations, evaluation procedures, and accounting requirements.

The number of schoolwide projects was estimated at 1362 in 1990-1991, twice the number that existed the previous year. Ten percent of Chapter 1 school districts have at least one school that is eligible to be a schoolwide project (75 percent of the students at or below the poverty level). Some 63 percent of the school districts with 25,000 or more students have at least one eligible school (Chapter 1 Implementation Study, 1991).

More schools could take advantage of the schoolwide project option if the percentage of Chapter 1 students required to qualify was dropped to 65 percent or even 50 percent. When 50 percent to 65 percent of a school's population qualifies for Chapter 1, it takes the whole school to provide the kind of environment these students need to be successful. All-school projects make each child everyone's responsibility.

Several schoolwide projects are in danger because they cannot maintain the level of funding expended during the previous year. Chapter 1 legislation states that funds used for schoolwide projects must equal the state and local funds spent per child in that school during the preceding fiscal year. Even if the state reduces the funding to the district, the law does not permit the district to reduce the level of funding in schoolwide programs. If the level of local funding for all other schools in the district is reduced, the level of expenditure in schoolwide programs must still be maintained by the district.

Districts that cannot afford to maintain their own level of funding cannot provide extra funding for schoolwide projects or pick up the difference in the amount the state is able to provide during these times of dramatic economic stress. The legislation could be written to require districts to fund schoolwide projects at the same level provided for students in other programs in the district, with Chapter 1 resources added as a supplement to the regular resources.

EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Evaluation is another problem Chapter 1 projects must contend with. Requirements that gains be reported in normal curve equivalent (NCE) units and that students be tested with a nationally normed test or a test that has been equated to a nationally normed test force districts to use standardized tests even when the district is moving toward alternative evaluation techniques.

Current emphasis on standards and performance outcomes has encouraged educators to use other indicators of success, such as portfolios and exhibitions, criterion-referenced tests, increased promotion rates, improved grades, and so on. Some schools have established procedures that eliminate formal testing below third grade. This emphasis on developmentally appropriate, personalized, usable evaluations does not fit Chapter 1 requirements. The legislation could be repealed or altered using permissive language that allows alternative assessments.

According to Allington and McGill-Franzen, special education and Chapter 1 programs serve students who cannot be differentiated in terms of educational achievement or aptitude. Legal and regulatory requirements encourage school districts to separate and label children in order to give them special assistance. Special programs require elaborate, time-consuming, expensive identification and classification procedures.

The time spent in evaluation and testing is seldom used effectively to create the high-quality instruction these students need to succeed in regular classrooms. Identification of student characteristics, learning styles, and disabilities should be used to improve instruction, not to fill a requirement.

Many highly respected educators believe there are no instructional reasons to separate students by categories into different learning environments. In fact, instructional strategies might be enhanced using a unified delivery system. Some schools have designed programs that are inclusive, but the required paperwork creates a substantial burden and the constant threat of noncompliance creates an even heavier burden. The current system demands compliance, with little attention to enhancing the quality or quantity of instruction.

Allowing the merger of funds for similar purposes and for students with similar needs despite their category would eliminate many of the disadvantages of tracking and other disincentives that limit risk taking and creativity. Emphasis could be placed on achieving performance outcomes, rather than on methods of instruction or structure of programs.

The legislation must be carefully examined to provide emphasis on outcomes rather than procedures. Perhaps there is another way to think about federal resources and students with special needs. When we think of students as "problems" and the programs provided for them as "solutions," it makes sense to write the legislation and the rules and regulations as prescriptions with clear, discrete boundaries.

If, however, we think of the system of education as responding to the needs of students, families, and communities, it makes sense to create programs that allow flexibility, with emphasis on the individual needs of the students, families, and communities served. The system and the student share the responsibility for establishing an environment where everyone is a teacher and everyone is a learner. The system itself becomes a learning organization. Prescriptions do not create learning organizations.

INTERPRETING THE LEGISLATION

Beyond the wording of the legislation, there is the problem of interpretation of the legislation and the establishment of rules and regulations that support implementation of the legislation. For example, Sec. 1018(b) says: state and local funds must be used so as to

> supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such federal funds, be made available from nonfederal sources for the education of pupils participating in programs and projects assisted under this chapter and in no case may such funds be so used as to supplant such funds from such nonfederal sources.... No State educational agency, other State agency, or local educational agency shall be required to provide services under this chapter through use of a particular instructional method or in a particular instructional setting.

The first part of this paragraph has been interpreted to mean that Chapter 1-eligible students must receive instruction that is different from other students receiving instruction with nonfederal funds. Another way to interpret this section is to say that

Chapter 1-eligible students must receive instruction that is *enriched* through the use of federal funds. This interpretation opens up a variety of strategies and techniques.

A building staff might decide that the best instructional method is an inclusive structure with a Chapter 1-funded teacher working as part of a team with other non-Chapter 1 teachers. All teachers would work with all students on the team, both Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1. The instruction that all students receive would be enhanced, with special attention to Chapter 1 students to be sure they progress as expected. They would not have to be pulled out or labeled in any way that set them apart from their peers.

Direct instruction could be provided in areas of weakness, just as it would be in a pullout program, but peer modeling, cooperative learning techniques, higher-level thinking strategies, and many other methods could also be used effectively. This method, and many others using more inclusive models, would be considered out of compliance using our current interpretation.

Changing the way we interpret the legislation and rewriting the rules and regulations to support flexibility and inclusion may be harder than changing the legislation. People would have to give up "the way it has always been done." They would have to work together. They would have to take responsibility for the teaching and learning in their school and in their classrooms.

A different interpretation of the legislation or new rules and regulations would also eliminate conversations like one that took place between the principal of the school I spoke of at the beginning of this commentary and the state director of Chapter 1. After some time spent trying to figure out how to stay in compliance with Chapter 1 requirements and still implement the model that was working so well, the frustrated principal asked if there was any way the Chapter 1 teacher could work on a team in the classroom with Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 students.

The Chapter 1 director replied, "If two students were sitting at the same table, working on the same math problem, and one of them was a Chapter 1-identified student and the other was not, and the Chapter 1 teacher noticed that the non-Chapter 1 student had added the column of figures incorrectly and leaned across the table to correct the student's work, you'd be out of compliance!" I believe that there must be another alternative.

DENIS P. DOYLE

Senior Fellow
Hudson Institute
Washington, D.C.

Rather than repeat what I have already written on Chapter 1, I summarize below my findings and conclusions:[1]

- Chapter 1 should be fully funded to provide coverage for all eligible youngsters.
- All eligible children should have their Chapter 1 funds made available in the form of a negotiable certificate—a voucher or scholarship—to be used by them in the school of their choice, public or private, secular or religious.
- In simplest terms, the issue before the nation should be the best possible education for youngsters who need it, not federal support of government schools. It should be a matter of indifference to the federal government—except for its research interest—as to where a child attends school and enjoys the meager benefits Chapter 1 might provide. The alternative is the incomprehensible and indefensible bureaucratic nightmare that exists now.
- Disbursement problems—alleged to make a voucher program cumbersome if not impossible—are to be taken seriously only as an accounting and control problem; they present no insuperable administrative or managerial problems.

I remain convinced that the "problem" of concentration (or lack thereof) is an artifact of the program as presently conceived. The amount of money that would be available per child (as a voucher) would make the resource stream useful even in schools with few eligible children. Full funding would further alleviate this problem. It is, of course, possible to imagine an empirical resolution of this issue by actually trying it someplace, sometime, on a sensible scale.

The larger problem is the administrative and bureaucratic impulses that together conspire to make Chapter 1 a pullout program for most students. Schools should be explicitly encouraged to do anything but pullout programs; after school, before school, summer, weekend, tutorial, or all of the above.

Eligibility to participate in the program as it is currently framed raises tantalizing policy questions. Suppose the eligible student shows dramatic improvement? As the program exists today, he is supposed to lose Chapter 1 services (though I am extremely skeptical that such service loss is more than a bookkeeper's fancy in today's program). In any case, with Chapter 1 scholarships or vouchers, I would suggest that the student—which is to say the school he attends—should continue to get the

---

[1] See, for example, Chapter X of *Federal Aid to the Disadvantaged: What Future for Title I?*, a book that I coedited with Bruce Cooper (Philadelphia: Falmer Press); *Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools*, coauthored with Marsha Levine, in which we advanced the widely accepted idea that Chapter 1 should be fully funded; and my introduction to Thomas Vitullo-Martin and Bruce Cooper, *Separation of Church and Child* (Indianapolis: The Hudson Institute, 1987), a study of the United States Supreme Court case *Aguilar* v. *Felton* (1985) and its adverse effect on Chapter 1 children who attend private school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

voucher for a certain time. The student might, for example, receive the voucher for three years.

Such an approach would reverse the current set of institutional incentives which are designed to reward failure, and failure only. With this new regime, if students continued to fare poorly, even with a Chapter 1 voucher, the resources would still be there. But so too would they be for students that succeed, and the school would then have some additional flexibility for kids who needed it and could profit from it.

Finally, the *Aguilar* case has virtually destroyed a meaningful and rational process for serving students in religious schools. Parking buses or trailers near the school and other such devices are an absurdity. Chapter 1 vouchers would restore what had been an effective program (including cooperation between religious and public schools). In my introduction to *Separation of Church and Child*, I argue that such an approach would pass constitutional muster. Indeed, I believe that Justice Powell, in *Aguilar*, invites the Congress to submit such a plan. Plaintiff's attorney, A. E. Dick Howard, of the University of Virginia Law School, who argued the case before the Court—and won—agrees with this interpretation.

JOY FRECHTLING

Senior Associate, Booz Allen and Hamilton, Inc.
Bethesda, Maryland

I am focusing on decategorization—and the related issues of evaluation and decentralization—because I see decategorization as one of the critical issues for reconsideration during the reauthorization hearings. There has recently been an upsurge of interest in seeing Chapter 1 funds become less restrictive in terms of both who is served and the kinds of services that can be provided. Especially in situations in which there are large numbers of poor, underachieving students and where (in all likelihood the same school systems) revenues are falling significantly behind expenditures, there is a mounting need to be able to use Chapter 1 funds more broadly.

Although the current restrictions were put into place to protect the disadvantaged student and to ensure that funds intended for such students' support did in fact reach them, the steady proliferation of categorical programs has resulted in a fragmentation of the educational process. The provision that Chapter 1 funds can be used for whole-school programs once the concentration of students exceeds a certain level has helped somewhat, at least for the individual schools that qualify. However, the extreme demands made on systems by large concentrations of needy students may call for some broader-based solutions.

In addition, categorization, as it currently exists, is impeding other educational initiatives, particularly decentralization. Many large urban systems are undergoing, or contemplating, a significant change in governance and decisionmaking responsibility. Under proposed decentralization plans, much of the responsibility currently held by central offices would devolve to the schools. Plans vary in their details, but all consider to some extent both the business and instructional functions.

One traditional central office function that is hard to accommodate under existing decentralization plans is the set of activities and concomitant staff that have developed to support, monitor, and respond to issues related to categorical programs. Many large school systems have built up a subbureaucracy in the central office whose major function is to ensure that the requirements of the funding sources are carried out and that the programs are adequately assessed. While the central office clearly will have a role to play under any circumstances, the complexity of current program restrictions makes that role more complicated, and in most cases, more prescriptive than it needs to be.

The reduction of categorical requirements would fit in with the trend toward decentralization and would make the administration of programs like Chapter 1 more consistent with current educational practices. On the other hand, while a move toward decategorization would support decentralization efforts, such a change would pose significant problems for the existing program-evaluation structure. Even a superficial analysis suggests that a decategorized program and the existing evaluation system cannot comfortably sit side by side.

The evaluation system for Chapter 1 has been designed specifically to serve a funding mechanism that targets identifiable students and provides identifiable services.

- Chapter 1 has a long history of evaluation requirements.
- Most major national evaluations conducted over the last two decades or more have included an analysis of whether or not the program worked.
- An elaborate structure has been built and refined and re-refined to provide for project-level programmatic evaluations of acceptable quality.
- These evaluations have compared the achievement outcomes of subjects served with some comparison group; evaluations have also tried to avoid the confusion that occurs when Chapter 1 students also receive support from other funding sources or other programs.

Broadening the availability of Chapter 1 funds, as would occur with decategorization, would eliminate at least partially, and in many instances totally, the possibility of having evaluations that meet the criteria referred to above. There would be no treatment and control group; there would be only served students. There might well be no separate and identifiable program; just additional services that are provided to all, along with the various other supports that result from additional local, state, and federal funding sources.

A strong conflict arises, therefore, between decategorization and accountability as the Chapter 1 world has come to define the latter term. Any move to respond to local demands and to allow a broader base of services must be accompanied by significant changes in how the effects of the program are assessed, how the funds are audited, and what the whole concept of evaluation means for a vastly different set of services. In some ways, Chapter 1 will have to face a microcosm of a major dilemma facing the whole educational establishment today: the push-pull between the goal of giving the power to the people and the parallel goal of having a system to ensure that the people use the power well.

CAROLYN D. HERRINGTON
Associate Professor, and
E. JULIANA PARÉ
Research Assistant
Learning Systems Institute, Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

INTRODUCTION

The last two decades have witnessed increasing stress on urban areas and the children that live there. Structural changes in the economic base of many urban communities have resulted in declines in employment opportunities, depressed wages, and high poverty rates. The accompanying collapse of social and cultural networks in inner-city communities has resulted in extreme isolation and concentration of poor, minority residents.

Children have not been spared. Poverty rates for children are higher in urban areas than in suburban or rural areas. In 1985-1986, the child poverty rate for urban areas was 23.4 percent, while the suburban rate was 12.8 and the rural rate, 22.8 (Child Trends, Inc., 1988). The concentration of poverty is also higher in urban areas, particularly for very young children. In 1987, 61 percent of poor urban children under six lived in areas of concentrated poverty (defined as an area in which at least 20 percent of the population is poor), compared to 21 percent in suburban areas and 51 percent in rural areas. As conditions worsened, the demands placed upon the social programs designed to alleviate the situation increased in concert.

Chapter 1 is the primary federal school-based strategy serving low-income urban children, and it is among the programs that are having to face new demands with new strategies. As the problems it addresses become more complex and wider in scope, policy directions that can match the changing regulatory concerns must be decided and implemented. In general, these new policies must allow for the diversion of funds to the most needy areas and, most important, they must enhance compatibility with other existing social programs.

The purpose of this paper is (1) to track the impact of recent deregulatory provisions, referred to as schoolwide projects (SWPs), enacted in 1988 along with other amendments to Chapter 1, and (2) to discuss the effectiveness of this strategy given the increasingly severe problems facing many children in urban areas.

Method and Scope

This report summarizes data gathered from interviews conducted over the last two years at the district and building level with administrators and teachers involved in implementing Chapter 1 SWPs. The districts—Atlanta, Chicago, Dade (Miami), and Dallas—reflect the diversity of the country's large urban school systems in geographical mix and local educational contexts. The sampling captures three of the ten largest districts, a district with a highly innovative school-based management project (Dade), and a district widely considered to be one of the most troubled in the country (Chicago).

Data were collected primarily in winter 1990-1991 in telephone interviews with Chapter 1 district administrators. More focused interviews were conducted in winter 1991-1992 with four principals of schoolwide project schools in Dade County to assess the impact of the program on children living in areas of concentrated poverty.

Chapter 1 Background

Districts receiving Chapter 1 funds are required to target the assistance to schools with the highest concentrations of poverty. These schools must then select for service the lowest-achieving students in the content area (i.e., reading, math, language) designated for program support. Programs typically consist of remediation in reading and math delivered to small groups of students (3-8) who are pulled out of the regular classroom on a daily basis for 30 to 40 minutes per day (Birman et al., 1987).

Responding to criticisms that Chapter 1 services in heavily impacted areas would be more effective if resources were targeted on improving the entire school instead of a subset of the lowest achievers in the school, Congress changed provisions for allowing schools where the incidence of poverty was 75 percent or greater (P.L. 100-297, Sec. 1015) to become schoolwide projects. The new law requires that SWPs develop an approved plan for how the funds will be used and that students in these programs demonstrate, after three years, at least comparable levels of achievement to other Chapter 1 schools.

The schoolwide project provisions were meant to allow greater fiscal flexibility in expenditures of Chapter 1 moneys, as well as to address concerns regarding the isolation of Chapter 1 teachers and stigmatization of Chapter 1 students. Previously, moneys could be spent only on children who qualified as educationally disadvantaged. The provision allowing moneys to be spent on all the children in a school was intended to free administrators from the considerable paperwork burden of demonstrating that the funds benefited only eligible students.

FINDINGS

Despite the wealth of projected benefits, at the time of the four initial district interviews (winter 1990-1991), we found that only one district had pursued the schoolwide option actively. The reasons for some districts' reluctance to switch to the schoolwide model vary.

The Atlanta and Dallas districts, which had only three schoolwide projects each, expressed considerable concern about the fiscal impact of serving all children in the schools and the potential space crunch resulting from schoolwide class-size reductions. Dallas reported that it was not actively encouraging the expansion of schoolwide projects because the district could not afford more than a handful. Chicago had only six schoolwide projects and indicated that the activities surrounding a large-scale system reform through local school councils had, for the moment, eclipsed all other reform efforts.

Dade County, alone, enthusiastically endorsed the concept and had 48 schools designated as schoolwide projects. The appeal for Dade was that the schoolwide approach reinforced the district's own plans for increased school-site management and deregulation. Dade County's self-initiated innovations identified the school as the unit of improvement and experimentation. Besides the 48 schools currently designated as schoolwide projects, more were being planned for the upcoming years, and expectations were high that the approach would produce student learning gains.

We interviewed the principals of four elementary schools that had been designated schoolwide project schools in Dade County. The schools were selected based on the recommendations of district Chapter 1 personnel who identified the schools as being in areas of concentrated poverty and as having competent and articulate principals who could speak effectively to the impact of the schoolwide project at their school.

The student body at all four schools exhibited extremely high levels of poverty. Percentages of children participating in the free and reduced lunch program ranged from a low of 89 percent to a high of 96 percent. The two schools that tracked their annual mobility rate (the percentage of students leaving the school within the course of a year) recorded rates of 52 percent and 62 percent, respectively. One school, in the Little Haiti section of Miami, estimated an employment rate of 50 percent among the parents of the schoolchildren.

Interviews substantiated that fiscal flexibility was permitting resource allocation decisions that were thought to be more supportive of effective schooling: integrated instructional approaches, greater use of instructional technology, and improved parent and community relationships. As was intended by the drafters of the legislation, the fiscal flexibility was permitting a more unified, integrated, and concentrated approach to improved schooling outcomes.

More funds were being used for instructional support technology. Relieved of the need to monitor which student benefited from the technology, the principals indicated increased use of technology.

Three of the four principals mentioned the community relations benefits of the Chapter 1 schoolwide projects approach. Three perspectives were underscored:

- Parental involvement was enhanced because funds could be used to hire parent volunteers.
- Parents of Chapter 1-eligible children were more willing to volunteer in the school when their child had not been isolated as a weak student. As one principal put it, "Parents don't want to participate in a dummy program for their kids."
- All parents could now come in and use equipment, check out books, and otherwise participate in school activities.

Unfortunately, while all four principals were enthusiastic about the schoolwide project provisions and the flexibility it gave them in administering Chapter 1 programs, none believed it to be effecting any more than incremental changes, and only one could point to clear achievement gains as a result. The most frustrating element for the principals was the high mobility rate of the students, rendering the concept of annual NCE gains problematic at best.

For the same reason the schools were eligible for the schoolwide project option—high concentration of poverty—the principals believed that the obstacles the children faced (economic, cultural, and linguistic) were extensive. Yet, along with the freedom from certain provisions came greater accountability for outcomes. The schoolwide project provisions require that students demonstrate, after three years, levels of achievement comparable to other Chapter 1 participants (who do not live in similar areas of concentrated poverty).

Ongoing research in Dade County indicates that the schoolwide experiment has not been as successful as was hoped. In 1992, 42 SWP schools were evaluated. Twenty-two scored high enough to be continued, but 20 were discontinued.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

An overall assessment of the impact of the 1988 schoolwide project reform must conclude that the impact to date is modest. In three urban school districts, Chicago, Atlanta, and Dallas, the option had not been vigorously pursued. The reform seems to be having the least impact in Chicago. The entire system is reeling from massive, state-legislated restructuring which is overwhelming district personnel and overshadowing other initiatives. In Dade, it appears that the reforms are being implemented enthusiastically but, even so, only incremental improvements in those schools which passed their initial evaluations have been shown.

The Chapter 1 model emphasizes intensive concentration on key academic skills. It was established to administer to the needs of the growing number of poor students in the 1960s who were deemed to require special attention to keep pace academically with their nondisadvantaged peers. The 1988 schoolwide project reform helps to strengthen the model; it does not question it. *However, urban areas and the nature of poverty have changed dramatically since the 1960s. Now, for many urban districts, poor students with multiple problems are the norm. The concentration of poverty and weakened family and community supports are at much higher levels than in the 1960s.*

Chapter 1 must adapt itself to these changes. The sole focus on academic achievement that was the only standard prior to 1988 may be insufficient. The reality today is that for many urban schools the problems of poverty and low-academic achievement are intense and pervasive.

Recasting the Chapter 1 school as a full-service school would allow the resources and strategies within the Chapter 1 program to become part of a more comprehensive strategy addressing the needs of poor, inner-city children. A growing body of literature is documenting increased need among children and arguing the necessity of integrated and comprehensive policies to address them (Kirst, 1987; Schorr, 1988; National Health/Education Consortium, 1990). A case can be made that, for certain children, such services as after-school care and health screening or such integrated service strategies as intergenerational education or interagency case management are as important as and a prerequisite to academic instruction.

One policy option would be for the federal government to waive selectively restrictions concerning which services may be provided with Chapter 1 dollars for children in areas of high-poverty concentration. This would allow local school districts to leverage the Chapter 1 dollars more effectively, according to the mix of students and needs of the district. For example, moneys could be used for local infrastructure development to encourage collaboratives among social service, health, and education service providers or for integrated case management for children who have multiple problems and multiple service deliverers. Or, the moneys could be used to coordinate services and programs among other federal education programs. As was recently noted by a senior Education Department official in Washington, the many federal programs are increasingly serving the same child (Schrag, 1992).

Such a strategy would allow policy to advance beyond the current political impasse impeding flexible allocation of Chapter 1 resources in a manner which is responsive to need. This proposal would permit the Chapter 1 program to target differentially high-poverty-concentration areas through the use of discretionary waivers (not more funds); thus, less risk is run of upsetting the political consensus achieved currently.

In short, the Chapter 1 schoolwide project reform enacted in the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Education Amendments may not suffice to address the critical education and social problems of urban areas in the 1990s. The problems that beset inner-city schools are compounded by the larger economic, social, and demographic forces which are at work in the communities from which they stem.

The supplemental resources that Chapter 1 funds can offer districts may have a broader impact if used to strengthen the child/community support systems in addition to strengthening the academic program. The singular focus of Chapter 1 on instructional strategies and the only modest academic gains of the participating students may be limiting the impact of the funds. *A more complex set of interventions may be needed for urban children today, and Chapter 1 dollars could play an important role in the planning and coordinating of a comprehensive and integrated school/community approach.*

ELFRIEDA H. HIEBERT
Professor, School of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder
Boulder, Colorado

I have seen what is possible with Chapter 1 resources. I trust that the reauthorization will make the opportunities of poor children to receive access to good literacy instruction even greater. My comments about future directions for Chapter 1 emanate from a project on which I have been collaborating with Chapter 1 teachers and students over the past two years in two schools (Hiebert, Colt, Catto, and Gury, 1992). Following a description of the activities of the project and its outcomes, I will identify two lessons about Chapter 1 from this project and then draw recommendations from these lessons.

THE NATURE OF THE PROJECT

Reading Recovery has been expanding rapidly across the United States (National Diffusion Network, 1991). The tutorial model of that project is expensive and probably prohibitive in meeting the needs of schools where a majority of the children in a cohort enter school with low levels of literacy. My project addressed the efficacy of small-group experiences that implemented authentic tasks with embedded word-level instruction in bringing children in the bottom quartile to levels commensurate with their peers by the end of Grade 1.

We began with the research on emergent literacy (see, e.g., Hiebert, 1988) and asked about the nature of instruction that would be appropriate for young children and in small groups. Based on the support for authenticity of tasks in learning (Brown, Collins, and Duguid, 1989) and for word-level instruction in beginning literacy acquisition (Adams, 1990), an instructional model was developed in which Chapter 1 teachers worked with Grade 1 children in groups of three in a daily half-hour period.

Group meetings involved repeated reading of books (even for those children who did not know letters at the beginning of Grade 1) and writing in journals. From the first day of instruction, children were involved with two books daily. Instruction focused on oral and written rhyming words, using key words from these books. For example, several readings of a children's book like *I Wonder Why This Car Can't Go* might be followed by a discussion of words that rhyme with *go* or *car*.

Two cohorts of children have been involved in the project to date. In order to keep our ultimate goal in mind (that children will succeed throughout school), we have called the cohorts by the years they will graduate from high school: the Class of 2002 and the Class of 2003. The project continues to expand, and so participants for each class have been different. In fall 1992, instruction for the Class of 2004 will expand even more, with special education teachers applying similar instruction with those children who are identified early on in Grade 1.

Class of 2002

Only Chapter 1 teachers worked with this cohort during their first-grade year, but teachers were able to serve 30 percent of the cohort. Of the children who received Chapter 1, approximately 75 percent could read a primer passage or higher fluently at the end of Grade 1. Primer level constitutes the third quarter of Grade 1. As a group, Chapter 1 students moved from the bottom to the middle of the class.

The 25 percent of the cohort that was not reading at grade level returned to Chapter 1 as second graders. A substantial portion (27 percent) of the Chapter 1 group who learned to read as first graders moved out of the schools. They were replaced with an equal number of second graders who moved in but could not read. In addition, children who had not learned to read in Grade 1 classroom instruction joined Chapter 1. The project was adapted and extended to Grade 2. For example, teachers worked with children in groups of four.

Of the children served in Chapter 1 as second graders, almost 80 percent reached second-grade reading level. The children who graduated from Chapter 1 in Grade 1 (and received classroom instruction only in Grade 2) increased their reading proficiency to an average level of fourth-grade text by the end of Grade 2.

By allocating 30 percent of the Chapter 1 full-time equivalent (FTE) to Grade 1 and 20 percent to Grade 2, one-third of this cohort was served by Chapter 1. At the end of Grade 2, 87 percent of the bottom third of the Class of 2002 was reading at grade level or higher. Using data from comparison sites in the district, 28 percent of the bottom third would have been expected to become proficient at grade level or higher.

Class of 2003

The project has continued in Chapter 1. In addition, Grade 1 teachers agreed to apply the project strategies with the children who could be thought of as the "fourth quintile": the children who were higher than Chapter 1 students initially but had not learned to read the previous year. Through coordination between Chapter 1 and Grade 1 teachers, almost 40 percent of this cohort has been taught.

As children move to Grade 2, 75 percent of the bottom 40 percent of the Class of 2003 is reading fluently at grade level or higher. Consequently, fewer children will require Chapter 1 as second graders. A sizable number of the Grade 2 teachers have requested to participate with district and university staff in extending the project to their classrooms so that these levels can be maintained. This happened in fall 1992.

By every standard, the project has been successful. Classroom teachers and Chapter 1 teachers are working jointly on a vision of classes of students as successful human beings. On various measures (including standardized tests, which have many problems for young children, especially poor ones—Stallman and Pearson, 1990), children are reading and writing well and with interest. An invitation to the Class of 2002 to spend a morning reading with their Chapter 1 teacher during the summer was met with resounding success by children and their parents.

LESSONS FROM A SUCCESSFUL CHAPTER 1 PROJECT

I have learned some critical lessons from this project, lessons that I had not learned despite fairly extended participation as a teacher and researcher of literacy (see, e.g., Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, and Wilkinson, 1985, *Becoming a Nation of Readers*).

- ***Lesson 1: 85-90 percent of the bottom quartile can become grade-level readers by the end of Grade 2.***

The first lesson that I learned was that the majority of children who enter school at risk can become fluent readers and writers by the end of Grade 2. Clay, in implementing individual tutoring through Reading Recovery, discovered this pattern with first graders. Slavin, in restructuring instruction across schools, has discovered the same pattern. The contexts of these projects vary; what is constant is a commitment to bringing children to high levels of literacy.

I view our results and those of Clay, Slavin, and others enthusiastically. I am aware, however, that the effects of Reading Recovery in the United States have not been studied beyond the fourth grade. Fourth graders in Ohio State's first sample (see National Diffusion Network, 1991) had fallen to the bottom of the average band of their peers by fourth grade. Chall has reminded us repeatedly of the "fourth-grade slump," most recently in *The Reading Crisis: Why Poor Children Fall Behind* (Chall, Jacobs, Baldwin, 1990).

Consequently, we are examining ways to sustain and extend the gains from this early intervention as students approach the task that has been most difficult for American students: the comprehension of text in science, mathematics, and social studies (Applebee, Langer, and Mullis, 1988). We intend to develop an intervention aimed at "intensive" courses for the Class of 2002. Chapter 1 teachers would go into the classrooms and work with students for specific periods, perhaps 3 hours a week for one month in each fourth-grade class and then cycle back through the classes again.

We have proposed a model in which at least 40 percent of a cohort could receive the small group model aimed at developing fluency and meaning-making with narrative text in Grades 1 and 2, followed by intensive seminars provided in class by Chapter 1 teachers for Grades 3-5 (Hiebert, in review). Much of the current discussion around Chapter 1 restructuring relates to the placement of the teacher. The current conventional wisdom is that Chapter 1 teachers should work in classrooms, not pullout contexts. This conclusion, I propose, misses the point. The roles of Chapter 1 teachers need to vary, depending on the needs of children.

Our project has involved pullout in Grades 1 and 2. The intensive guidance that this provides would probably be impossible in classrooms if Chapter 1 teachers had to adapt and assist classroom teachers. At the same time, when children are pulled out and efforts are not focused on bringing them quickly to the level of their peers, the programs should be abolished.

Our project and Reading Recovery show that pullouts can be the site for intensive coaching. However, I am proposing that the "expository text coaching" that follows this early intervention occur in classroom contexts. Peer pressures and the need for guidance focused on classroom-specific text and strategies make the middle grades a different instructional context from the early grades.

- ***Lesson 2: A successful Chapter 1 program means fewer resources.***

The first lesson was a delightful surprise, especially when the standardized test scores came back. We knew that the children could read, based on our alternative assessments, but our analyses of standardized tests (see, e.g., Hiebert and Calfee, 1992) had led us to believe that children would do poorly on these tests despite their strong performance on alternative measures.

We have not become advocates of standardized tests. However, children have shown that they can transfer their literacy proficiency. Chapter 1 students of the Class of 2002 entered Grade 1 with an average normal curve equivalent (NCE) score (Gates-MacGinitie percentile rank equivalent, or PRE) of 16. Their score in the spring of Grade 1 was 34 NCE (comprehensive tests of basic skills, or CTBS). CTBS-Reading for the "graduates" in the spring of their second-grade year was 42. Students have maintained their performances and are even becoming better readers and writers in the classroom.

The success of the children on the standardized test, however, turned out to have unhappy consequences. The guidelines from the state Chapter 1 agency emphasize services for the schools with the lowest test scores. One of the participating schools lost part of an FTE, which went to one of the nonparticipating schools.

The schools were also punished in another way. Since the majority of children in the bottom quartile had learned to read as first graders, the Class of 2002 received fewer Chapter 1 places as second graders. Even when the university team offered their services (an outstanding teacher trainer/graduate student was conducting her dissertation on the second-grade extension), there was concern about explaining to the state Chapter 1 office the decision to serve second graders at the 25-30 NCE level when fifth graders at the 20 NCE were not served. The prognosis for resource allocation for the Class of 2003 is even worse, since a higher percentage of the bottom one-third is reading at the end of Grade 1 than was the case with the Class of 2002.

There was still another way in which the success of the project was self-defeating. Within the current structure, my plan to work with the Class of 2002 as third graders in the "intensive seminar format" on expository text strategies was not possible. Chapter 1 teachers would need to have these children on their list for the entire year, but they no longer qualify because they are reading too well.

But the question remains: Has any American intervention been able to sustain effects with poor children without adaptations in the instruction of the grades subsequent to the intervention? Two of the scholars with the most expertise and vision in the field of literacy tell us that instruction subsequent to the intervention requires extensive adaptation to match children's new knowledge (Chall et al., 1990; Durkin, 1974-1975).

Punishment for a job well done defeats the purpose of Chapter 1. During the first year of the project, I had heard rumors that the resistance to the project from a classroom teacher emanated from a concern that Chapter 1 resources would be taken away. I simply shook my head in disbelief when I heard this comment. In the fall of the second year after resources had been reallocated, I found out that the teacher had known something I did not. In fall 1992, the second-grade teachers extended parts of the project with members of the Class of 2003.

While many teachers will work hard to give all children the best of opportunities, I wonder how long some classroom teachers will participate as zealously when they see dwindling support services because of these collaborative efforts. Classroom teachers need to collaborate with Chapter 1 teachers in taking responsibility for the learning of initially low-performing students. It may well be, however, that too much collaboration in these schools could mean that there are no Chapter 1 teachers to sustain critical elements of the successful project in a year or two.

Since federal and state policies are often interpreted idiosyncratically at the local level (Brown, 1991), I read Chapter 1 reports and talked with individuals around the country. Apparently the current Chapter 1 structure does penalize success. I see no reason why schools could not be given designations according to various economic indexes. The "effective schools" literature (Purkey and Smith, 1983) had ways of identifying schools that did better than anticipated. Such indexes could be used to identify exemplary programs, which would then receive additional funding.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I make two recommendations based on these lessons. I offer them with the aim that Chapter 1 be the structure that ensures that children who depend on schools to become literate have access to the best possible instruction.

- ***Renew the commitment of Chapter 1 to high literacy levels for poor children.***

Set instructional goals for Chapter 1, making clear the expectations and beliefs that all children can be brought to high levels of literacy. The single most important activity that our project does is to continually talk about the eagerness and abilities of young children to learn. Such a conversation needs to permeate the Chapter 1 structure at the national, state, and district levels. Chapter 1's sole function is to make good on the expectation of poor children and their parents that they will learn to read and write in school.

Support the implementation of "diversified" models of interventions that provide for both early and intensive aid so that children are brought to high levels of literacy as first and second graders. These models should also include structures that sustain this early literacy proficiency and extend it in grades 3-5 with support in content area reading and writing.

- ***Change the reward structure so that schools that achieve these high standards can maintain their successful programs.***

Develop a monitoring system so that schools that do not achieve these high standards work in conjunction with successful schools that have equivalent socioeconomic profiles. Develop peer systems across schools so that teachers in schools where conversations about children and their families are negative and debilitating can work with teachers in schools that are bringing poor children to high levels of literacy.

HAROLD HOWE II
Senior Lecturer on Education
Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

The main point I want to make about improving the use of Chapter 1 funds in schools that are eligible for them is that the use of funds for staff development should be both authorized and encouraged. In saying this I am not suggesting the traditional type of staff development that hires an expert, has her (him) lecture the teachers for an hour or so followed by a discussion period. Then it is assumed that the teachers have the message and will alter their classroom activities accordingly. Such passive activities are a waste of time and money.

What's needed in the individual school is an arrangement to identify teachers willing to reconsider their classroom strategies and to work together to plan, carry out, and assess changes. Their main focus should be on what is sometimes called "active learning," rather than the passive practice of students sitting in neat rows, listening to the teacher, and occasionally responding.

Students must be helped to plan their own learning and to work with other students to advance it; the teacher's role should shift to being an enabler and a resource for student learning activities. Such classroom routine requires teacher time for advanced planning and for follow-up with other teachers. It may also require opportunities for teachers to visit classrooms where active learning is working, either in their own school or outside it.

In most schools, the curriculum to be taught is, to some degree, prescribed, but how it is taught should be determined by teachers, particularly those who are willing to explore ways of encouraging active learning through such endeavors as cooperative education, group projects among students, peer tutoring, well-planned field trips, and the like.

Too much Chapter 1 money goes into drill-type activities to repair shortcomings in academic work and not enough is used for the kinds of activities outlined above. Students served by Chapter 1 funds especially need the challenge of interesting schoolwork, rather than repetition of exercises on which they have failed. The overdose of remediation that now characterizes academic work supported by Chapter 1 fails to motivate students and tends to lower the expectations of their teachers.

Fundamental to the concepts involved in bringing about the kinds of changes suggested above is the idea of getting rid of the factory model of classroom procedure. Because doing that requires teachers to rethink what they do, the essence of bringing about this change involves planning time for teachers.

Secondly, I think that more flexible use of Chapter 1 funds should be encouraged. The notion that there should be an accounting trail showing that these funds are used only on eligible students has been destructive of learning. Authorization for schoolwide use of the funds in schools with a high concentration of such students makes good sense.

Finally, I believe that additional requirements for standardized testing in the regulations or legislation of Chapter 1 would be destructive of the purposes.

HENRY M. LEVIN
Director and Professor
School of Education, Stanford University
Stanford, California

For me, Chapter 1 represents a dilemma. In my view, you cannot change substantially what happens to low-income students without changing what happens to all students in schools attended by low-income students. In general, I will argue that no group of students can be assisted in significant ways unless the school supports the needs of all students; this support will require broadly based social and political movements at the state and local levels to augment the necessary changes. It will not happen even with the best-intentioned changes in Chapter 1.

Let me be more specific about my assumptions. My first assumption is that the only defensible goal for low-income children is to bring them into the educational mainstream so that they are academically able. Small, but statistically significant gains in standardized achievement tests are not adequate as a goal. These children must become whole human beings with full citizenship and economic participation; full academic participation is an important precursor to later full social participation in adulthood.

Second, to bring such children into the academic mainstream requires much more than can be measured by existing assessments that can be calibrated on the normal curve equivalent (NCE). Even the most pragmatic use of existing tests suggests their inadequacy. For example, many suggest that the tests may not measure everything that is important, but at least they predict workplace performance (based upon Japanese and German success). In fact, test scores have a predictive validity of about .25, meaning that they can explain about 5 percent of the variance in earnings or supervisory ratings. If you control for the educational level of the worker, the predictive validity declines. A student's ability to recognize a list of words that he or she has been exposed to or to find the right answer on a multiple-choice test that measures reading comprehension of a paragraph does not indicate a good education.

My third assumption is that piecemeal changes in school programs—even though very well intentioned—will not make much difference in student outcomes. We have a half-century of experience with continual replacement of textbooks, curriculum, and instructional strategies with little or no sustained improvements.

From these assumptions, I conclude that we need to:

- Consider what a mainstream performer must be able to do and settle for nothing less from our low-income students; moreover, the entire school must be dedicated to this objective.
- Establish methods of assessment that are consistent with these goals.
- Find ways of transforming the entire school to make these goals a reality.

How can Chapter 1 assist in doing this? Most important, we are referring to a change in school culture as opposed to a change in rules, regulations, guidelines, directives, policies, reports, and so on. Thus, the major dilemma is how Chapter 1, legislated at the federal level, administered at the state level, and implemented at the local level, can be used to change school culture.

My answer is that the necessary conditon for Chapter 1 success is the establishment of a supportive act that provides resources, broad guidelines with considerable leeway, clear goals for bringing students into the mainstream, incentives for doing so, and technical assistance. The sufficient condition for success is ensuring that at the state and local levels there are effective means to build capacity of local schools to succeed.

The accelerated schools project worked with 150 schools in 1991-1992, a number that will double in 1992-1993. We have found that the building of school capacity to create a culture in which the school is dedicated to bringing all children into the educational mainstream and adopting the practices to do so is the most neglected aspect of change. As a member of the Commission on Chapter 1 of the Council of Chief State School Officers, I believe that the recommendations of the commission will make great headway toward meeting the necessary conditions for success of a federal act, providing that adequate appropriations are made.

However, the sufficient conditions will require a change at the local level, a change that is unlikely to be effected by federal policy. The sufficient conditions can be obtained only through broad-based movements at the state and local levels, with widespread support from a range of constituencies, incuding educators, parents, taxpayers, civil rights groups, religious entities, and social service agencies. That coalition must support changes in the home and school arrangements for all children and settle for nothing less than bringing all children into the mainstream.

State and local governments must provide the financing and organization so that schools do not continue to see each marginalized group as a special case that requires special programs within a school that stays basically the same. The entire school must be transformed to provide the types of enrichment, stimulation, and success that are the basis for learning success for both children and adults. School staff must be supported in this endeavor for rethinking and rebuilding the entire school rather than adding a "new" Chapter 1 program to what is a largely ineffective approach, not only for Chapter 1 students, but for most students.

A "microrevolution" at the state, district, and school levels is required if new and more supportive Chapter 1 provisions are to make a difference. Several models of change might be considered for such an endeavor, including those of the Accelerated Schools Project, the Coalition of Essential Schools, and the approach of the Yale Child Study Center associated with James Comer. Since details on each of these models is available, I will not review them.

The real challenge of Chapter 1, however, is to find a way of matching improved support through federal legislation with social movements at the state and local levels to transform the entire school, thereby enabling it to bring all students into the educational mainstream. This transformation will require a philosophical, cultural, and political revolution at all levels, pursued simultaneously with supportive changes in Chapter 1.

FLORETTA DUKES McKENZIE
President
The McKenzie Group
Washington, D.C.

Disadvantaged and academically at-risk students traditionally require educational supports and reinforcement in addition to those provided to the general student population. This reality is the foundation for various federal programs in education, such as Chapter 1, which focuses mainly on delivery of services within schools. However, Chapter 1 can improve its effectiveness by taking into account the findings of education researchers and practitioners regarding factors in the surrounding community, outside the traditional school walls.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION

Education research indicates that an important factor affecting the achievement of at-risk students is external community involvement and support. At the same time, education practitioners recommend integrating educational services for students, parents, families, and communities as a way to improve the chance for long-term success of education interventions. In response to both informed voices from the field and research findings, initiatives focused on family, community education, and intergenerational learning are gaining widespread support. However, a lack of funding prevents widespread replication.

Chapter 1 can effectively respond to this situation by broadening its definition of (1) acceptable providers of educational support and reinforcement and (2) supplemental education services for disadvantaged students and their families. Chapter 1's commendable recognition of the value of parental involvement should be strengthened and expanded.

The inclusion of the larger community in a network of programs covering such areas as social services, health services, and family literacy would greatly enhance the learning outcomes of disadvantaged students. In addition, it would enable the nation to move ahead at a faster pace in achieving the education goals set forth by President Bush and the nation's governors.

The well-catalogued deficiencies of schools that serve large numbers of disadvantaged students have led to some effective collaborations with the private sector and higher education institutions. Chapter 1, in its current configuration, has encouraged and supported parental collaborations. A logical next-phase expansion in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act could provide similar encouragement to community collaborations, thus expanding the schools' capacity to improve disadvantaged students' achievement levels.

EXPANDED SCOPE FOR CHAPTER 1

In addition to reaching out to the communities surrounding the schools it serves, Chapter 1 needs to expand its scope to serve a larger number of students overall.

Across the country, school systems, boards of education, and education schools—under the rubric of reform—are being challenged to develop and perfect more effective ways to teach and deliver educational services to students. National studies suggest that an important measure of education reform will be the ability to educate the "bottom fifth" of the student population. But in many areas served by Chapter 1, the at-risk population comprises a far greater segment of the total school population.

The Council of Great City Schools reports that more than 57 percent of the students attending its 47 urban school systems are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. The majority of the remaining students attending these schools are only marginally better off. They, too, are educationally at risk. The economic reality for urban students requires a reassessment of this school-related economic indicator. Chapter 1's current percentage requirement for schoolwide project eligibility should be lowered to both reflect more accurately and respond to this economic reality.

EVALUATION OF CHAPTER 1 SERVICES

Evaluation is an important companion to education services and is yet another area of concern in Chapter 1 reauthorization. The configuration of the current authorization of Chapter 1 does not ensure effective evaluation. For example, the current three-year parameter on schoolwide project eligibility status does not adequately consider developmental learning and remediation issues, nor does it allow for variant learning styles. Substantive evaluation, given the at-risk student population's education attainment deficiencies, necessitates data collection covering at least a five-year span.

Furthermore, the national education community is currently questioning the validity of standardized testing and exploring options for alternative evaluation models. In anticipation of these changes, the 1993 Chapter 1 reauthorization should modify its testing requirements to reflect and incorporate research findings germane to disadvantaged and minority student achievement.

I recognize that Chapter 1 is not meant to be a community or economic development policy. However, as educators critically assess and respond to the range of factors that affect the achievement of disadvantaged students, the reality dictates an expansion of mandates. For education reform to be effective and reflective of a national movement, federal program mandates must be equally reality-based. By expanding its reach into the community outside the school, by serving a larger number of students, and by attending to the requirements of thoughtful evaluation, Chapter 1 can maximize the effectiveness of education reform efforts and scarce education dollars.

EDWARD J. MEADE, Jr.
Senior Advisor
Academy for Educational Development
New York, New York

I hope that you will carefully examine the clients of Chapter 1 who also are within the bounds of other categorical aid programs, particularly in the areas of bilingual and special education. Obviously, there is need for better coordination. More importantly, provision might be made for funds from these various programs that target the same students, so that these funds may be used more generally and less category-specifically, thus providing a "pool" to more closely "fit" the full set of needs of low-income students. You may also examine relationships with other federally funded programs that provide other social and health services to Chapter 1 students.

The practice of pulling Chapter 1 students out of regular classrooms needs to be revised so as to allow these students to be more fully and better served in their regular classrooms. My observations of and experiences with teachers of regular classes in which pullout occurs underscores the need for more integration. Children are *whole* persons and not Chapter 1 for this or that and regular for some other things.

Care needs to be exercised in looking at Chapter 1 as a school finance lever to ensure that any such funds are not used by states and localities for tax relief. No doubt you are aware that in some states increased funds for financially disadvantaged districts have been used for such a purpose rather than for improving the range and quality of educational and related services for low-income students.

I have been concerned for some time that the need for program evaluation and accountability (certainly legitimate) has sometimes—in some cases, often—been the tail that wags the Chapter 1 dog. For starters, I'd be pleased to have you study the costs (real and contributed) for evaluation and accountability at the local district, state, and federal levels. I'd like it for the individual school, but that's asking too much. Sometimes, I think we spend more time, effort, and resources to evaluate than we do to improve that which is being evaluated.

STANLEY POGROW
Associate Professor, College of Education, University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Improve the quality of teachers by exempting seniority as a basis for Chapter 1 assignments.
2. Stimulate the development and dissemination of higher-quality Chapter 1 interventions.
3. Focus available funds where they can do the most good by limiting the amount of service a student is eligible for in grades K-3 and 4-7 and by not serving students who are highly mobile and who are borderline educable mentally handicapped (EMH).
4. Eliminate the requirement to serve those most in need. Many of the lowest-performing students should not be in Chapter 1.
5. Allow commingling of Chapter 1 and special education learning-disabled (LD) funds and students, or the switching of students between Chapter 1 and LD, so that the students from both groups needing metacognition-based interventions in grades 3-8 would be combined into Chapter 1 and the students below 80 verbal IQ would be combined into LD.
6. Establish separate policies and accountability requirements for grades K-3 and 4-7. The learning problems at these spans differ and require totally different interventions.
7. Require the use of standardized tests, but prohibit fall-to-fall testing.
8. Do not extend schoolwide models at this time—they should probably be limited even more.
9. Prohibit indirect administrative charges.

INTRODUCTION

These recommendations are based on my work in developing and disseminating the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) program, a two-year thinking-skills approach to Chapter 1 for grades 3-1/2 to 7.[2] HOTS has grown rapidly over its 11 years and was used in approximately 1800 sites in 47 states in 1992. HOTS started four or five years before the Chapter 1 law was changed to include "advanced" skills; thus, it was a successful pioneering effort.

The following recommendations are based on real-world experience in working with schools and districts on a large scale with an innovative approach to Chapter 1. The recommendations attempt to put the debate about what is needed in the reauthorization of Chapter 1 on a less philosophic and more practical basis in terms of the needs of the students. The HOTS experience suggests that Chapter 1 can be made far more effective.

---

[2] I am currently developing HOTS-Math, a thinking-in-mathematics curriculum for middle schools, with support from the National Science Foundation.

Unfortunately, the HOTS experience also suggests that many of the more popular reforms currently being advocated, such as new tests, providing all services in the first three grades, liberalizing schoolwide models, etc., not only will not address the real learning and administrative problems, they will likely make them worse. Reform must address the student's real learning problems, and real problems with *local* flexibility and capability—problems that cannot be made to go away with buzzword reform advocacy.

IDENTIFYING THE REAL LEARNING PROBLEMS

Research from the HOTS project suggests that most Chapter 1 students are bright, but that they have two different learning problems that must be addressed separately in different stages. The initial learning deficit problem in the early grades is that students have a content deficit. After the third grade the big problem is that students do not understand how to understand. (I have described these problems in more detail in *Phi Delta Kappan*, January 1991 and April 1992.)

These students have the ability to become successful academic learners—but only if they receive the "right" amount of the "right" type of support, at the "right" time, over an extended period. For the first time, it appears possible to determine what these "rights" are. Developing the natural intellectual ability of Chapter 1 students requires the following three different stages for overcoming three different learning problems:

Stage 1—Overcoming the Basic Concepts Knowledge Deficit (K-3)

During this period students need to learn the basic facts and symbols of school, along with some basic strategies for reading. The basic learning problem in Stage 1 is a lack of prior knowledge and experiences, a *content* deficit. The focus of Chapter 1 services at Stage 1 should be basic skill and basic strategy development. That is why computerized drill is particularly effective at the early grade levels (and has little effect later on). That is not to say that there should not be any type of general thinking development, but just that the major emphasis should be on learning specific content and strategies. The success of Reading Recovery suggests that the optimal approach is to provide several months of Stage 1 services in the first grade.

Stage 2—Developing a Sense of Understanding (3-1/2–7)

The fundamental learning deficit after the third grade is that the students do not understand "understanding"—i.e., they do not know how to begin to deal with symbolic ideas. Occasional thinking activities in the regular classroom are insufficient to overcome the enormous general thinking deficit, and intensive thinking-in-content classroom activities overwhelm the student who does not understand "understanding."

Remediation does not work after the third grade because the learning problem has shifted. The new learning problem needs a highly creative, nonremedial approach, such as HOTS. The worst thing you can do after the third grade is teach specific pieces of content and/or drill Chapter 1 students in specific pieces of content. Such drilling or content instruction reinforces the Chapter 1 student's tendency to view information as discrete entities, which is what is really preventing them from learning more complex content in the first place.

A second stage is needed to develop students' sense of understanding through immersion in general thinking activities—thinking activities divorced from the regular classroom curriculum. During this stage, students develop a sense of how to work with and synthesize ideas, which they start applying spontaneously in the classroom. This enables them to learn classroom content the first time it is presented—which is the ultimate linkage between Chapter 1 and the classroom.

Stage 2 requires a specialized program with a skilled, highly trained teacher. Getting students to the point where they have internalized a sense of understanding requires ongoing experiences in getting adult reaction to their attempts to construct meaning and solve problems. It must be a process-oriented learning environment rather than a direct instruction one. Daily, intensive, personalized, interesting, and sophisticated conversations with an adult who gets students to probe their own ideas for general understanding are needed for a year and a half to two years for students to internalize a sense of understanding.

Stage 3—Thinking-in-Content; Exemplary Academic Courses (6-8)

Once students have internalized a sense of understanding, they are ready to move from general thinking to academic course work. The key need at this stage is to provide the students access to interesting, high-quality academic course work that incorporates extensive problem solving. The biggest support need at this stage is probably for students to have a place to study after school and to get help with their homework. They need an alternative to the streets. (While such help would be useful earlier, it is more critical at this stage.)

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL CHAPTER 1 POLICY

The HOTS experience suggests that while it is possible to prepare Chapter 1 students to enter high school as highly qualified learners, a quick fix at a single grade level, with a single type of ongoing service, will not work. The three-stage model provides a powerful explanation of why Chapter 1 has been ineffective at certain grade levels, and provides the basis for a more scientific approach to delivering Chapter 1 services. It calls for more refined and precise techniques, rather than new buzzword solutions. Different services must be provided at each stage.

Funds must be allocated so that students who can be helped can receive the types and amounts of services needed at each stage, as opposed to spraying moneys and services across the board until available funds run out. Chapter 1 funds should be used to first help those educationally disadvantaged students who are performing below their intellectual potential and who can best benefit from the extra service. These students should be provided with state-of-the-art specialized services at each stage.

Chapter 1 should use its categorical funding to set a new standard for what educational practice can and should be. The following key changes are needed in federal policy if the knowledge generated from successes such as HOTS and Reading Recovery is to be operationalized on a larger scale.

- ***Improve teacher quality by exempting seniority as a basis for Chapter 1 assignments.***

Significant improvement will not occur in Chapter 1 without a high-quality teacher force. The understanding deficit that the typical Chapter 1 student has is so great that it will not be overcome without the best teachers and teacher training, particularly at Stage 2. Unfortunately, there is often not enough local flexibility to substitute a high-quality teacher for a poor one because the individual currently assigned to Chapter 1 in a school/district often has seniority in that position.

- ***Stimulate development and dissemination of higher-quality interventions.***

The best teachers also need new and more effective curricula and approaches. The biggest problem is not the evaluation measures but the failure of the academic/reform community to develop consistently effective models. As a result, practitioners are left to wander back and forth between the present ineffective method and the opposite ineffective method. At any one time, half the United States is moving from in-class models to pullouts, and the other half is moving from pullouts to in-class.

Unfortunately, the development of more powerful Chapter 1 models presently receives no support. A small program that would provide the opportunity to develop and experiment with new high-risk approaches is needed. Modest sums would be provided to individuals who wanted to try out a new approach. The money should just be enough to allow someone who has a burning intuition and desire to work through his/her ideas.

Support for the initial dissemination of new approaches should also be provided. Choosing the right alternative dissemination mechanisms is as important a determinant of a program's impact on student learning as the design of the program itself. Dissemination support needs to be provided for promising programs. This can include either special federal grants, increased funding for the National Diffusion Network, or some combination of the two.

- ***Focus available funds by limiting services.***

The NEA points out that half of the needy students are not currently served by Chapter 1. What that ignores is that the half that is served, is served and served and served and served. Too many students never get out of Chapter 1 and come to depend on the extra help. Indeed, there is little incentive for schools to get students out of Chapter 1. As a result, Chapter 1 becomes a continuous service until the money runs out. Skipping providing service at a given grade level requires an involved needs assessment.

The only way to move from uniform, continuous, general service to specialized services at the different stages is to limit the amount of funding any one student can receive at any stage, and eliminate low-payoff services. While limiting the amounts of Chapter 1 service provided to any student at a given stage may seem cruel, students who do not benefit after several years never seem to benefit.

In addition, current knowledge could be used to establish fair limits, such as providing a maximum of only one year of service in grades K-3, two years in grades 4-7, and two years in grades 8-12. Once a student had received a year of service in grades K-3 (in a given school), he or she would not be eligible for additional service until reaching the fourth grade. At the very least, schools should be allowed automatically to skip providing services at one grade level at each stage.

Instead of spreading resources thinly trying to service everyone, regardless of whether the services are likely to help, it is recommended that Chapter 1 not serve students who constantly switch schools and those who are borderline mentally handicapped. An exception should be made at the first grade, where students should still be served on the basis of greatest need. Research shows that it is a critical grade, and Reading Recovery can produce large gains over a short period.

- ***Eliminate the requirement to serve those most in need.***

As special education services are cut back and IQ levels for qualifying are dropped, increasing numbers of borderline educable mentally handicapped students are falling into the cracks between special education and Chapter 1. Chapter 1 should focus on students who are not performing according to their intellectual ability; it should not serve borderline EMH students. It breaks my heart to see students who truly do not have the ability to make connections between ideas. Yet, if the proportion of borderline EMH students in Chapter 1 continues to increase, it will become impossible to provide exemplary services to the majority of Chapter 1 students who need, and can benefit from, such programs.

You cannot provide a state-of-the-art intervention if there are a significant number of borderline EMH students. Unfortunately, current practice requires that you serve the most in need first. This has led to a major inequity, as many urban schools cannot reach above the 15th percentile with Chapter 1 services, whereas others can serve up to the 40th. This inequity prevents students in the 20th to the 40th percentile in urban districts who need the services from obtaining them. Indeed, it can be argued that the students in the 20th to the 40th percentile need the services more, as they often make the most progress.

As a result it is recommended that the new regulations allow more flexibility in servicing students below the 15th percentile. Districts should be allowed to determine on an individual basis whether to serve students below that level. The determinant should be whether the students are scoring low because they had a bad day on the test, or whether they are scoring at their true potential.

- ***Allow commingling of Chapter 1 and special education funds and/or realign student categories.***

Or, allow the switching of students between Chapter 1 and LD, for Stage 2 metacognition-based interventions. There is reason to believe that the major learning problem with most LD students is metacognition, which is the same problem that most Chapter 1 students have. Most LD students do very well in HOTS, regardless of whether they are by themselves or mixed in with Chapter 1 students. The exceptions are students with severe dyslexia, severe behavioral disorders, or short-term auditory recall deficits. (The latter is probably a proxy for low IQ.)

Indeed, recent HOTS project research found that LD students with above 80 verbal IQ did well in HOTS. This suggests that instead of dividing students along the lines of Chapter 1 and LD, they should be divided along the lines of those above 80 verbal IQ who need metacognition development, and the others placed in a new special education category. As of this moment, both Chapter 1 and LD are serving two very different populations within each program. Both Chapter 1 and LD are servicing some students who are borderline EMH, and others who need help in developing metacognition skills. The latter should be recombined into a new type of Chapter 1 program (in grades 4-7) that focuses on developing metacognition and other key thinking skills.

In order to reduce the number of special programs and certifications, schools with metacognition development programs should be allowed to service LD students together with Chapter 1 students at Stage 2. Special education funds should be used to support the LD students, but the Chapter 1 teacher should be allowed to provide the service without any additional certification requirements.

Alternatively, if it is not possible to commingle the funds then some student categories should be shifted between Chapter 1 and special education. Borderline EMH students should be shifted from Chapter 1 to special education. In return, LD students who do not have short-term memory or dyslexia should be shifted to Chapter 1 for Stage 2 metacognition services. This would provide a reasonable exchange which would result in a Chapter 1 population that was more homogeneous in terms of achievement potential.

- ***Separate policies and accountability requirements for each stage.***

It is important that separate policies, including accountability provisions, be established for each stage. For example, simply averaging overall effects across grade levels and seeing which schools do not meet the minimum standard mask important problems.

Suppose that a school drills students extensively in grades 1-6 and that it has an average gain of four normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in grades 1-3 and a loss of two NCEs in grades 4-6. The school will show an overall gain sufficiently large not to have to file a program improvement plan, even though the program is failing Stage 2 students. The school should be required to file a program improvement plan for Stage 2.

Separate analyses should be done at the different stages, particularly the first two. This is true for all Chapter 1 policies. Across-the-board policies, such as the provision of in-class services and the requirement of coordination, will help at one stage, but hurt at another. For example, coordination with the classroom is important at Stage 1, but the more you coordinate Chapter 1 services to reinforce the specifics of what is being taught in the classroom in Stage 2, the more you inhibit the student's ability to learn.

Federal legislation should push even harder for nondrill approaches at Stage 2. This may be done by strengthening the language requiring advanced skills in grades 4-7, perhaps even prohibiting the use of drill approaches at those grades.

- ***Require standardized tests but prohibit fall-to-fall testing.***

Nationally normed standardized test scores by and large tell the truth. In addition, standardized test scores have shown themselves to be sensitive to the effects of well-designed alternative, nonremedial approaches, such as James Comer's, HOTS, and Reading Recovery. However, fall-to-fall testing is highly discriminatory. It favors those who are pushed by parents to read over the summer. School effects from quality interventions take much of the school year to manifest themselves, particularly at Stage 2. Spring-to-spring is the most accurate form of testing.

- ***Do not extend schoolwide models at this time.***

While schoolwide models are an important idea, they are still experimental. I strongly suspect that they will not prove to be as effective as innovative specialized Chapter 1 programs. Expanding the schoolwide model at this time by lowering the minimum eligibility concentration from the current 75 percent will virtually guarantee that highly impacted schools will not use specialized Chapter 1 services for any of their students.

Current street experience indicates that schools operating under the 75 percent requirement do not have enough funds to provide specialized programs at both Stage 1 and Stage 2 to the most needy. If the minimum cutoff were lowered, say to 60 percent, then funds for 60 percent of the students would be spread across all. At that point there would not be enough money for even a single specialized service for the most needy. For this reason, it is recommended that the cutoff point be raised to 80 to 85 percent.

Schoolwide models are very popular with principals and classroom teachers. That doesn't mean that they will be effective. A reduction in the minimum cutoff should not be done in the absence of very convincing data on sustained student growth beyond the third grade from schoolwide models. Indeed, the only argument in favor of schoolwide models is that they will enable a school to improve overall classroom instruction and that such improvement is the best way to improve instruction for everyone.

Three factors argue against expanding schoolwide models. First, the moneys will probably end up being spent on general aid to balance the general education budget.

Either the moneys will be used to supplant funds that would have been otherwise allocated for teacher training and other categories, or will be used for politically popular, but educationally ineffective initiatives.

"Success for All" schoolwide pilots have cost $400,000 per school for just grades K-3. Given street realities, it would probably cost twice as much to provide the same level of additional services once Johns Hopkins staff were not determining how the money was spent. Extensive interviews with school-level administrators indicate that most schools will tend to use a substantial portion of available schoolwide funds for reducing class size to a minor extent and/or for providing salary increases.

These types of general improvement expenditures will not improve classroom instruction. In addition, they will actually reduce the pressure on local school officials to do what is really needed to improve the regular classroom situation. Using Chapter 1 funds for general improvement in poorly administered schools will likely result in throwing good money after bad.

The second argument against expanding schoolwide models is that the problems with classroom teachers in high-impact schools are usually not minor ones that can be fixed with minor bits of extra help. Classroom instruction problems are often too severe to be overcome. Increasingly, the HOTS project has been forced to recommend that HOTS teachers compensate for incompetent classroom instruction by providing some of the basic classroom knowledge they need in addition to the HOTS service.

Third, Stage 2 problems cannot be solved in the context of the regular classroom once there is a critical mass of students who do not understand understanding. Once teachers have a certain number of students in their classroom who do not understand understanding, their efforts to teach in a more complex fashion are thwarted, no matter how good they are.

Chapter 1 needs to remain a highly specialized intervention. However, it should be upgraded to provide services that use the best teachers, the best techniques, and the best teacher training. It must ensure state-of-the-art instruction, even if only for part of the day. Outstanding instruction with the right curriculum is so powerful that even providing it for only 35-50 minutes a day in a concentrated form can have substantial benefits. It is the fuel of substantial intellectual growth. HOTS shows that this is feasible.

Students clearly do better in HOTS if they have quality classroom instruction. But it should not be Chapter 1's job to provide classroom instruction: that is the job of the existing massive education infrastructure. If that general education infrastructure of administrators, coordinators, and professors is so flawed that it cannot deliver quality instruction, turning Chapter 1 into general classroom aid will not help. Despite the interdependence of improving educational opportunity in the classroom and expanding students' abilities to take advantage of those opportunities, the two tasks differ fundamentally. Chapter 1 should focus on the latter.

Chapter 1 is now the best source of moneys with which to do something bold and exceptional to enable students to take advantage of educational opportunity. It should set the standard and blaze the trail of new techniques that classroom teachers subsequently emulate.

The upcoming reauthorization of Chapter 1 should not favor one approach over another. The next five years should be used to develop and test new approaches and fine-tune current promising approaches. I suspect that we will find that a state-of-the-art Chapter 1 curriculum taught by a few exceptional teachers will stimulate educationally disadvantaged students intellectually and socially to a far greater extent than schoolwide general aid that tries to make everyone in a school a little better.

- ***Prohibit indirect administrative charges.***

Some districts respond to increases in Chapter 1 by increasing indirect overhead costs. Given the tight educational budgets, there will be tremendous pressure for school districts to usurp as much Chapter 1 funds for the general administrative budget as possible. It is critical that all available Chapter 1 funds be used to provide direct student services. The purpose of Chapter 1 is to help a district compensate for the inability of its basic program to meet the needs of students; it is hard to see a rationale for allowing indirect cost charges.

CONCLUSION

If both practitioners and reformers can move beyond their cliches, it is possible to substantially improve Chapter 1 services. Rather than jumping on the bandwagons of early intervention, schoolwide models, and general classroom aid, we need to develop more specialized programs that better address the *real* learning problems of Chapter 1 students at different stages. Much of the current problem in Chapter 1 results from a misunderstanding about the nature of the fundamental learning problems at different developmental stages.

The HOTS experience indicates that it is possible to identify the nature of the learning problems and the resultant needs more precisely. Most reform proposals seem to have nothing to do with removing the real federal and local impediments to providing more precisely focused quality services. Providing such services requires that Chapter 1 move from playing follow-the-leader to becoming the source of the most creative and effective programs in American education.

LAUREN B. RESNICK
Director
Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

I start with some basic principles.

- The Chapter 1 system should be designed to encourage continuously rising levels of achievement.
- Achievement should be measured against an absolute standard which all children should be expected to achieve.
- The system should be designed so as not to favor pullout instruction.

These principles point to the following more specific suggestions:

- ***Encourage continuously rising achievement.***

At minimum, funds should not be jeopardized when students' achievement rises above certain levels. This probably means funding on the basis of poverty eligibility only, without regard to entering achievement levels. An alternative (complex and therefore second best) would be to continue eligibility indefinitely, or until a specified age, or for a certain number of years, once a child has been identified as a Chapter 1 recipient. A more active incentive system would require a school (not an individual teacher) to show rising achievement from year to year in order to continue to receive Chapter 1 funds. However, this would need to be carefully worked out, including plans for funding to follow children who are transferred to a different school and provision for tracking children who change schools.

- ***Measure against an absolute standard.***

The tests used today (the standardized, norm-referenced tests) are particularly debilitating for poor, minority, and low-achieving children. Because they compare children with each other rather than with an absolute standard, they basically relegate children who start behind to stay behind forever.

The only way for children who start out in the 25th percentile to reach the 75th would be for many others to stop learning and wait for them to catch up—not likely and not a very good prescription for American education as a whole. Although they can't usually articulate it, poor parents and their children understand this. The result is profoundly discouraging; nobody (including the children and their parents) expects these children to succeed (as indicated by higher test scores) and so the children see no payoff for effort.

For educators, the system also works against long-term effort. If they do succeed in pushing scores up so that more and more children score "above grade level," there are "Lake Wobegon" accusations, such as those of Dr. Cannell. If measured against an absolute standard of achievement, some children might take longer to meet the standard than others. But all could meet it with adequate effort on the part of student and educators.

- ***Don't favor pullout.***

The Chapter 1 regulations are widely viewed as requiring segregated instructional time for Chapter 1. This makes it easier to ensure that the money is spent on the intended children. Perhaps it is also based on a theory of "special help" instruction. But there is not much evidence that pullout instruction helps, and quite a bit of more general evidence on tracking suggests that it might be bad for children. I don't want legislation or regulation against pullout or for any particular arrangement. I want to see those choices left up to the educators closest to the children—on the assumption that the overall incentives in the system favor efforts to keep achievement rising year by year. In other words, design a performance-driven system and let the schools organize instruction in any way that works. This is compatible with, but would not mandate, schoolwide improvement plans.

I am very interested in the idea of using Chapter 1 funds for nonschool services. Generally, I think we need to look beyond the school for the full range of educational needs and possibilities, but at the same time retain it as the focal point for organizing services to children.

I am no expert in school finance, but it does seem that concentrating funds, rather than spreading them around, would be more educationally effective and would help in equalizing funding for the poorest districts. There could be some political losses from such a move; the program would lose support from congresspeople whose districts did not receive funds. Perhaps now is the time to push for increased overall funding, with new funds concentrated on the neediest districts.

E. G. SHERBURNE, Jr.
Consultant
Washington, D.C.

Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act seeks to improve the educational achievement of disadvantaged students. It assumes that the principal cause of poor educational achievement of disadvantaged students is poor education. And like most other projects aimed at improving educational achievement, it assigns the responsibility for solving the problem to the school.[4]

Presenting improved schooling as the primary means of improving educational achievement ignores the other forces that affect students and their achievement. These forces include parents, siblings, and peers; hunger and nutrition; local and national values; violence and drugs; and television. They influence educational achievement, far more often negatively than positively, at all economic levels. And they especially influence the achievement of students from low-income families.

Those who invoke better schools as the solution to educational achievement also fail to recognize the revolution in society caused by television, which has eroded the exclusivity of formal education as the principal source of learning and the role of the teacher as the principal dispenser. Through no fault of their own, schools can never be as powerful as they once were in society, and teachers can never have the status they once had.

Thus, schools and teachers as a whole are not as influential as they once were, and their educational efforts are further weakened by powerful nonschool forces that negatively influence educational achievement. These forces are so strong that, even with equalized resources, schools teaching the disadvantaged cannot hope to have any serious impact on the achievement problem. Achievement may rise to the unsatisfactory level of other schools, but this is scarcely a solution.

Clearly, the equalization of educational resources among weakened schools will not solve the problem, for even with more resources, the schools cannot do it alone. It is not just that the children of low-income families have lower levels of school resources than other groups. They also have substantially lower nonschool resources, which are as important in the equation as schools. As these nonschool resources are largely outside the domain of the schools, school resource equalization does not affect them. Any equalizing attempts involve different entities, and needless to say, different funds.

In my opinion, until all the forces that affect educational achievement are attacked in a coordinated manner, it is doubtful that any substantial and lasting result will occur. Schools cannot solve the educational problem independently of the rest of society.

The solution requires an integrated approach at the community level—one that would include, at a minimum, housing, safety, health, and education. It should be emphasized that this approach is not one of educational reform, but rather one in which community management of all entities, including education, is the central element. In short, education would be incorporated into the community approach, rather than the community being incorporated into the educational approach.

---

[4] E. G. Sherburne, Jr., was formerly the president of Science Service, Washington, D.C.

The educational policy of the approach would also recognize that education can and does take place outside of school and at any time. For this reason, the school would not maintain its monopoly in providing learning. Thus, learning opportunities would be offered by entities other than schools, at other than school hours, and for subjects other than the traditional curriculum.

There is nothing new to these ideas. They have been talked about in the past, though they have never been given a real chance. Some version of them should be tried, because a reformulation of Chapter 1 is not sufficient. To repeat, schools cannot solve the educational achievement problem independently of the rest of society. And they should not act as though they can.

ROBERT SLAVIN
Director, Elementary School Program
Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

In their first quarter-century, Chapter 1 and Title I have made an important contribution to the education of low-achieving disadvantaged students (Slavin, 1991). Perhaps the best indication of this contribution is indirect: the slow but steady reduction in the achievement gap between African-American and Hispanic students and white students is often attributed to an effect of Chapter 1/Title I (e.g., Carroll, 1987). Yet, it is always possible to make a good program better.

Chapter 1 can be much more than it is today. It can be an engine of change in the education of disadvantaged children. It can ensure the basic skills of virtually all children; it can in essence help our nation's schools put a floor under the achievement expectations for all nonretarded children, so that all children will have the basic skills necessary to profit from regular classroom instruction. It can help schools toward teaching of a full and appropriate curriculum for all students, but particularly for those who by virtue of being at risk too often receive a narrow curriculum emphasizing isolated skills. It can make the education of disadvantaged and at-risk students a top priority for all schools.

For 25 years, Chapter 1 has overwhelmingly provided remedial services to children who are falling behind in basic skills; in fundamental thrust, it has changed very little. Yet we know a great deal more today than we did 25 years ago about effective programs for students at risk and about how to help teachers successfully implement effective programs. If compensatory education were just beginning today, it would probably be structured quite differently from the way it is now. This paper proposes a research-based vision of what Chapter 1 could become.

PREVENTING EARLY READING FAILURE

Perhaps the most important objective of compensatory education is to ensure that children succeed in reading the first time they are taught and that they never become remedial readers. The importance of reading success in the early grades is apparent to anyone who works with at-risk students. The consequences of failing to learn to read in the early grades are severe. Disadvantaged students who have failed a grade and are reading below grade level are extremely unlikely to graduate from high school (Lloyd, 1978; Kelly, Veldman, and McGuire, 1964). Chapter 1 itself has few effects beyond the third grade (Kennedy, Birman, and Demaline, 1986). Retentions and special education referrals are usually based on early reading deficits.

One outcome of widespread reading failure is a high rate of retentions in urban districts. In many, 20 percent or more of first-grade students are retained, and more than half of all students have repeated at least one grade by the time they leave elementary school (Gottfredson, 1988). In the early grades, performing below grade-level expectations in reading is the primary reason for retention in grade.

Almost all children, regardless of social class or other factors, enter first grade full of enthusiasm, motivation, and self-confidence, fully expecting to succeed in school (see, for example, Entwistle and Hayduk, 1981). By the end of first grade, many of these students have already discovered that their initial high expectations were not justified and have begun to see school as punishing and demeaning. Trying to remediate reading failure later on is very difficult, because by then students who have failed are likely to be unmotivated, to have poor self-concepts as learners, to be anxious about reading, and to hate it.

Reform is needed at all levels of education, but no goal of reform is as important as seeing that all children start off their school careers with success, confidence, and a firm foundation in reading. Success in the early grades does not guarantee success throughout the school years and beyond, but failure in the early grades does virtually guarantee failure in later schooling. This problem must be solved.

Our "Success for All" program (Slavin et al., 1992) provides all students in highly disadvantaged schools with research-based preschool, kindergarten, and reading programs, family support services, and one-to-one tutoring from certified teachers for first graders who are falling behind their classmates. After three years, many Success for All schools have not a single third grader two years behind in reading; 12 percent of matched control students are at least this far behind. This and other evidence suggest that reading failure is preventable for nearly all children, even a substantial portion of those who are typically categorized as learning disabled.

If reading failure *can* be prevented, it *must* be prevented. Chapter 1 is the logical program to take the lead in giving schools serving disadvantaged students the resources and programs necessary to see that all children learn to read.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

One of the most fundamental principles of Chapter 1/Title I has been that compensatory funds must be focused on the lowest-achieving students in qualifying schools. In principle, this makes sense in that it avoids spreading Chapter 1 resources too thin to do low achievers any good. In practice, however, this requirement has led to many problems, including a lack of consistency or coordination between regular and Chapter 1 instruction, disruption of children's regular classroom instruction, labeling of students who receive services, and unclear responsibility for children's progress (Allington and Johnston, 1989; Stein, Leinhardt and Bickel, 1989).

It is time to recognize that the best way to prevent students from falling behind is to provide them with top-quality instruction in their regular classrooms. I would propose that some substantial portion of Chapter 1 funds (say 20 percent) be set aside for staff development and adoption of programs known to be effective by teachers in Chapter 1 schools. For example, by hiring one less aide, schools could instead devote $20,000 per year to staff development, a huge investment in terms of what schools typically spend but a small one in terms of what Chapter 1 schools receive.

For $20,000 per school (about $1,000 per class in elementary schools), the school could pay for (1) extensive in-service, in-class follow-up by trained "circuit riders,"

(2) release time for teachers to observe each other's classes and to meet to compare notes, and (3) needed materials and supplies. The achievement benefits of effective classroom instruction all day would far outweigh the potential benefits of remedial service.

There are many examples of classroom programs which have been much more successful for low-achieving students than remedial services. In reviews of the literature on effective programs for students at risk (Slavin, Karweit and Madden, 1989; Slavin, Karweit, and Wasik, in press), we identified several such programs. In addition, many of the exciting innovations in curriculum currently being discussed are not affecting poor schools, but could do so with the support of Chapter 1 funds.

Many schoolwide change programs could also be supported by Chapter 1 staff development funds, such as James Comer's (1988) model, Theodore Sizer's (1984) "Re: Learning" approach, Henry Levin's (1987) Accelerated Schools model, and our Success for All program (Slavin et al., 1992). The federal government would have to take several steps to enable Chapter 1 to focus on staff development and program adoption.

- ***First, research and development would be needed to create and evaluate programs likely to make a difference with students in general and Chapter 1-eligible students in particular (Slavin, 1987, 1990).***

This means support for both promising development projects and independent evaluations of educational programs conducted by researchers other than the developers. Initially, independent evaluations of programs already in existence would be an excellent place to begin. Research on methods for disseminating and replicating effective practices in Chapter 1 schools is also needed. I would propose that 1 percent of Chapter 1 funds be set aside for development, research, and evaluation, of programs for Chapter 1 schools.

- ***Second, the federal government should provide support for dissemination of effective programs to Chapter 1 schools.***

One model for this is the National Diffusion Network, which funds developers/disseminators to set up dissemination programs and state facilitators to bring validated programs into state schools. In addition, funds might be provided to state departments of education or other agencies to provide direct support to schools in adopting effective instructional models. A key element of such a program would be to make certain that teachers and parents, as well as administrators, have a role in choosing programs to implement in their schools.

For this to work, it is critical that schools have a wide choice of different methods known to be effective for Chapter 1 children (and others); this reinforces the importance of continued R&D on effective practices. At the district and school level, program facilitators or circuit riders who are experts in given programs could be provided to help individual teachers and schools implement those programs (Slavin, 1987).

Chapter 1 should not only be a staff development program; there is still a need for service targeted to individual children (for example, to provide tutoring to first graders having difficulty in reading). However, without a major investment in staff development, Chapter 1 services will always be shoveling against the tide, trying to patch up individual children's deficits without being able to attack the root of the problem, the quality of instruction in the regular classroom.

Under current regulations, schools can use a small proportion of their Chapter 1 dollars for staff development, but this rarely goes into the kind of training, follow-up, and assessment needed to effectively implement validated programs. One-day workshops with no follow-up are far more typical.

The obvious objection to devoting substantial resources to staff development is that students not eligible for Chapter 1 would benefit from Chapter 1 dollars at least as much as those who are eligible. This objection can be answered in three ways. First, Chapter 1 accountability procedures should continue to focus entirely on the achievement of Chapter 1-eligible students, so schools implementing programs for all students have to make certain that they are making a difference with low achievers.

Second, to withhold effective and cost-effective programs from eligible students because noneligible students might benefit is perverse. Third, regardless of their own personal characteristics, poor students in schools with large numbers of poor children achieve less well than equally poor students in less disadvantaged schools (Kennedy, Jung, and Orland, 1986).

Students in schools serving disadvantaged students deserve assistance even if they are not low achievers themselves. We should be particularly concerned about poor and minority students who may be doing well enough to avoid Chapter 1 identification but are still not achieving their full potential. Such children do not need direct service, but there is certainly a strong rationale for federal assistance to improve the quality of their regular classroom instruction.

IMPROVING ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Chapter 1 has increasingly become an accountability program as well as an instructional program. Chapter 1 students have long been assessed on norm-referenced tests, and the results of these assessments have been used to identify effective and ineffective Chapter 1 programs. In districts with high Chapter 1 participation, performance on Chapter 1-mandated assessments is a major factor in evaluations of principals and teachers.

The 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Act introduced new accountability provisions. These go under the general heading of program improvement. Under the regulations (U.S. Department of Education, 1990), schools are principally evaluated on the basis of year-to-year gains in normal curve equivalents (NCEs).

In theory, the program improvement guidelines represent a major step forward in changing the focus of state monitoring of Chapter 1 from compliance with regulations to achievement of children. In practice, however, the standards have some serious flaws (see Slavin and Madden, 1991).

First, schools are rewarded for having Chapter 1 students make NCE gains in comparison with the previous year, *starting in second grade.* This means that effective early interventions, such as preschoool, extended-day kindergarten, or first-grade tutoring, do not contribute to success in NCE gains, and in fact may make such gains more difficult by raising the end-of-first-grade scores which are usually used as a baseline.

Second, an NCE gain standard rewards schools which have high retention rates in grades two and up. Students who are retained typically show NCE gains of 10 to 20 or more NCEs solely because they are a year older and take the same test (Slavin and Madden, 1991).

Third, any accountability system based on traditional group-administered, norm-referenced standardized tests can reward teaching to the narrow set of skills which appear on the test. As a result of accountability pressures since the late 1970s, many districts have closely aligned their curricula and instruction to the standardized tests, and they have consequently cut out instruction on topics (such as social studies, science, and writing) that do not appear on the standardized tests (Shepard, 1990).

For Chapter 1 accountability to result in solid improvements in student performance, several changes are needed (see Slavin and Madden, 1991, for an elaboration of these points). First, the assessments must be changed to measure the full set of skills and understandings we want students to have, so that "teaching to the test" produces exactly the breadth and appropriateness of instruction we would want for all children (Wiggins, 1989).

Second, we need to include kindergarteners and first graders in the assessment scheme, so that investments in early intervention will contribute to a school's success in meeting accountability goals. Assessment of young children will require individually administered tests of language and reading, rather than group-administered tests. These tests could be given by Chapter 1 teachers from other schools, so the costs could be moderate.

Third, scores used for Chapter 1 accountability purposes must be adjusted for retention. For example, if a test gives a 20 NCE "bonus" for retaining children (as is now often the case), then 20 NCEs could be subtracted from the scores of retained students. This would correct the system which now inadvertently rewards schools for retaining large numbers of children. Finally, schools should be evaluated based on the degree to which they can move low achievers out of the lowest achievement categories, not just raising low achievers' mean performance levels.

TARGETING CHAPTER 1 RESOURCES

As the regulations work now, Chapter 1 resources are distributed to districts and schools based on the percent of students in poverty; many are then distributed within schools based on students' actual performance. However, the poverty requirements are very low. This is why school districts serving middle class communities often receive significant Chapter 1 resources and why 58 percent of students who receive Chapter 1 services are not themselves from poor families (Kennedy et al., 1986).

These policies create a bizarre phenomenon. Most large districts concentrate their Chapter 1 funds in their poorest schools. This means that the poorest school in a wealthy district may receive significant Chapter 1 funds, while a far poorer school in a large urban district will not, because the urban school is not as poor as others in its district.

The broad targeting of Chapter 1 helps maintain the political popularity of the program, but it is otherwise hard to justify. Congress has addressed this issue in setting aside funds for "concentration grants" to districts with high numbers of children in poverty, but there is still a need to target Chapter 1 funds far more on schools that serve students from poor communities. I would propose that schools in which at least 30 percent of students qualify for free lunch receive all or nearly all Chapter 1 funds.

Within schools, school staffs should be given the freedom to serve students who most need service, removing the cumbersome identification procedures and "supplement-not-supplant" regulations that have so inhibited innovation in Chapter 1. As long as Chapter 1 is concentrated in schools serving poor students and as long as accountability procedures emphasize gains among low achievers, it seems reasonable to trust schools to make their own decisons about whom to serve and allow them to adjust these decisions flexibly.

In essence, all Chapter 1 schools (or at least those with at least 30 percent of students qualifying for free lunch) should be organized as schoolwide projects. Experience with districts that have made major investments in schoolwide projects show that this approach lends itself to responsible innovation and schoolwide adoption of effective practices.

CONCLUSION

Chapter 1 is extremely important to our most vulnerable children. For 25 years, it has focused attention and resources on low-achieving students in disadvantaged schools. Yet Chapter 1 can be much more than it is today. It can become proactive in preventing learning problems rather than only reactive in remediating problems which are already serious. It can ensure literacy for every child; it can become a major force in bringing effective programs into schools serving disadvantaged students; and it can reward schools for doing a good job with at-risk students.

Chapter 1 provides only 2.5 percent of all education funding. If properly directed, however, this 2.5 percent can leverage the other 97.5 percent to help students in all schools achieve at the level we now expect of our best schools.

WILLIAM L. TAYLOR and DIANNE M. PICHÉ
Law Offices of William L. Taylor
Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION

American educators increasingly believe that virtually all children, including those born into poverty, can learn at the highest levels and that public school systems should be held accountable for ensuring that they do so. The key, in the view of many, is to set high standards for all, to fashion new forms of assessing what students know and can do, and then to hold schools and school systems accountable for ensuring that students make progress.

We subscribe to this view as the approach best calculated to eliminate dual standards and to create genuine equality of opportunity for all children. But if high standards and accountability are to be more than pious hopes, all schools must have the resources needed to create environments for educational success. We focus here on three types of resources that must be provided under Chapter 1 if schools are to succeed:[5]

- *Adequate funding and programs at the school level.* This means that LEAs with the highest concentrations of poverty in a state must get a greater share of Chapter 1 dollars. The archaic system that makes the funding for a child's education depend almost entirely on the property wealth of the district in which the child's parents reside must be reformed.
- *Informed parents.* Parents in low-income areas must be equipped with the skills they need to support their children's education, and teachers must be trained to avail themselves of parent resources.
- *Adequate health care and nutrition.* The external barriers to learning—the lack of adequate health care and nutrition for children born into poverty—must be eliminated. Schools have an appropriate role to play in ensuring that these needs are addressed.

THE FUNDING FORMULA

Current school financing systems operate to rob children born into poverty and locked into property-poor urban and rural areas of the basic resources—good teaching, counseling, a broad curriculum—that they need to achieve in public schools (see, for example, Kozol, 1992, Taylor and Piché, 1990, Chapter V). These and other funding inequities should be addressed in the Chapter 1 reauthorization.

---

[5] Many of the recommendations herein are embodied in the final report of the Independent Commission on Chapter One, for which the authors serve as counsel. See *Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty*, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C., December 1992.

The current Chapter 1 formula is flawed in three fundamental ways. First, it assumes that states' needs for supplemental assistance reflect their current per pupil expenditures. Thus, poor states (primarily in the South) receive far less per poor pupil than wealthier states, for example, New York and New Jersey. While the cost of living may indeed be higher in the Northeast, that fact alone cannot explain the enormous disparities in per pupil spending between, say, New Jersey and Mississippi, where the difference is more than $4000 per child (Taylor and Piché, 1991, p. 19).

Second, the formula assumes level resources among school districts *within a state*. But it is pure fiction to regard Chapter 1 as "supplemental aid" that comes in on top of an already adequate program to provide the "extra" boost low-achieving children need in high-poverty schools. We found in our 1990 report to Congress (pp. 50-51) that while this may be true in many suburban districts with high tax bases, it is far from the case in many urban and poor rural districts that enroll high numbers of poor children. In these districts, Chapter 1 is no supplement; rather, it must purchase services and other items routinely bought with nonfederal funds in wealthier jurisdictions.

Third, the formula assumes equality of need, on an eligible child basis, among districts. School districts receive allocations per poor child on a relatively equal basis throughout the state. The impoverished Baltimore City school system receives the same per pupil award as bordering suburbs of Baltimore and Howard counties, despite research showing that students who are most severely disadvantaged educationally are those who attend schools with very high concentrations of low-income children.[6]

We recommend the following approaches to these problems:

- Amend Chapter 1 to require statewide comparability.
- Target more funds to the highest poverty districts.

We recommended that Congress require states to assure the Secretary of Education that they will provide statewide comparability of essential education services among school districts. Specifically, to be eligible for Chapter 1 funds, a state should be required to ensure that children with similar needs receive comparable services, without regard to attendance zone or school district. Thus, for example, a child in the poorest inner-city neighborhood would have opportunities for early childhood education and access to a curriculum and materials comparable to those provided to children in the wealthier suburbs.

The programs and services to be included under the new comparability standard should be determined by Congress after testimony and deliberation. In *Shortchanging Children* we identified: preschool programs, reading programs in the early grades, adequate pupil/staff ratios, counselors, social workers and parent involvement, and experienced teachers teaching in their area of certification. After inquiry and debate, Congress might add to or alter this list. For states that failed to achieve comparability, the remedy would be either termination of all Chapter 1 funds to the state, or a redistribution by the Education Secretary of the state's allocation directly to the poorest districts.

---

[6] The respective poverty rates for these school districts, based on current free lunch-eligibility data are: Baltimore City, 67 percent; Baltimore County, 14.7 percent; Howard County, 5.9 percent; see *Baltimore Sun*, November 17, 1992, p. 4B.

We favor a formula that abolishes concentration grants, because these grants now are such a small percentage of the appropriation and so many districts are eligible as to render them an almost insignificant supplement to the basic grants. The local education agency (LEA) formula instead should:

- Provide higher per pupil awards to higher-poverty LEAs and lower per pupil awards to lower-poverty LEAs
- Derive from a per pupil weighting system that is graduated to avoid inequities in funding levels between two or more relatively similar districts in a state
- Provide a positive adjustment to the allocation to districts with large numbers (e.g., over 6000) of poor children.

We oppose a statewide poverty-concentration ranking of *schools* for purposes of determining eligibility. Such a system has been recommended to address the inequity that obtains when some schools in high-poverty LEAs are not served while schools with the same or lower poverty concentration in wealthier LEAs are served. We believe this problem must be addressed by a redirection of resources to high-poverty LEAs to enable them to serve more children and more schools. In our view, however, a uniform school-poverty threshold across the state would encourage the segregation or resegregation of schools by race and income.

EMPOWERING FAMILIES

Parents and other adult caregivers are a child's first and most important teachers. The foundations for learning and the enjoyment of school are laid in the home and in the early childhood years. Parents have a vital role to play throughout a child's school years. Joyce Epstein at Johns Hopkins University has identified five types of parent involvement, all of which are associated with positive outcomes for both students and schools (*Educational Leadership*, 1989).

In the past Chapter 1 has focused, to varying extents, primarily on only one of these types of involvement, the role of parents in the governance of schools and in designing the Chapter 1 program. But educators and child advocates now recognize that the most important contribution parents can make to a child's education is to create and maintain a literacy-rich and learner-centered environment for the child during the time—the majority of his or her wakeful hours—spent outside the school building from birth through age 18 (R. Clark, 1989).

A revised Chapter 1 should emphasize all components of effective parent involvement, especially family literacy. By a "family-literacy" approach, we mean that Chapter 1 should require schools to invest heavily in the education and training of parents and teachers toward the greater goal of empowering parents to support learning and literacy development at home and in the community during off-school hours. The requirement could be fulfilled, for example, by conducting Even Start-type programs with Chapter 1 or other funds on the school site or in another accessible location in the community.

Other options that Congress might consider include: increasing the Even Start appropriation; converting Even Start from a competitive grant program to an LEA entitlement, at least for high-poverty LEAs; distributing Even Start funds only to Chapter 1 schools; and ensuring the coordination of services and personnel between Chapter 1 and Even Start.

Other revisions to the law are needed to:

- Guarantee parents access to observe their child's class and to obtain data and documents with information about testing and other aspects of the program.
- Inform parents, in a meaningful way, about curriculum instruction methods, what performance standards their children will be expected to achieve in each grade and subject, and how their child will be assessed, and ultimately, about how their child is doing in school; they must be sufficiently informed to be able to hold schools accountable for progress.
- Meet basic needs of low-income families. A child who is homeless, sick, hungry, or abused cannot learn well, or at all. And a parent with similar problems, and perhaps also facing employment and educational barriers, often cannot provide the support the child needs to succeed in school.

Recognizing that public school systems cannot provide health and social services, we would propose, under Chapter 1, to require

- States and school districts to identify barriers to learning faced by low-income children and their families, e.g., lack of access to health and social services, including preventive care.
- States to take steps to eliminate these barriers and to require school districts to ensure that children are referred to appropriate helping agencies.
- School districts to work toward both collocation of health and social services (including child care) on the school site and better coordination of services among the various provider agencies.
- All Chapter 1 schools to ensure that children are fully immunized upon entering school and to conduct periodic health screening, including hearing and vision testing.

THOMAS B. TIMAR
Associate Professor, University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California

CHAPTER 1 AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMPETENCE

After nearly 30 years of trial and error with federal compensatory programs in education, we may conclude that policy can change some dimensions of schooling (formal structures like governance, assessment, and finance), while other dimensions (the opaque mass of variables that define teaching practices) strongly resist external pressure (see, for example, Cohen and Spillane, 1992; Meyer, 1986). Therefore, policymakers must look beyond the formal structures of law—the preeminent policy strategy of the past 30 years—as the principal instrument for policy change. This is not to suggest, of course, that formal legal structures should be abandoned, but to suggest that they should, instead, constitute only one element in a complex of institutional variables.

Making Chapter 1 into a lever for organizational improvement necessitates new ways of thinking about the relationships between policy and instructional practice, as well as a new vocabulary to define those relationships. Though current Chapter 1 policy, as defined by the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford amendments, moves beyond procedural mandates, program improvement must go beyond accountability to building organizational capacity.

Student outcome assessment will probably continue, in some form, to play a central role in the evaluation of Chapter 1 effectiveness; it is important, however, to connect that assessment to the schooling experiences of students. As research has shown, little is known about the connection between program variables and student outcomes. While particular program features do not uniformly predict student outcomes, some schools have better Chapter 1 programs than others (Rowan and Guthrie, 1988).

The critical question for policymakers is how federal dollars can strengthen the capacities of schools to provide rich educational environments for low-achieving, disadvantaged children. Given the present level of resources, we may be asking schools to achieve the unachievable. Schools are expected to show achievement gains for students who are among the nation's most disadvantaged. Moreover, schools are expected to do so with meager resources—approximately 100 hours of instruction over the course of an academic year—and little external assistance.

Nor does current policy take account of the pervasive problems outside the schools. Poverty, crime, unemployment, and high mobility are among the problems that resist solution through school improvement. Clearly, federal efforts to improve the academic achievement of generally poor, mostly inner-city children must take a broader view.

Hence, the focus of federal programs needs to shift from designing compensatory and remedial programs for various student needs to creating effective learning environments for all students, whether they are poor, learning-disabled, handicapped, language-deficient, or gifted. Neither entitlement nor accountability has been able to accomplish that objective. The alternative suggests two simultaneous policy directions:

- ***First, de-emphasize the formal, structural mechanisms of policy implementation (e.g., procedural rules, accountability, etc.); emphasize, instead, the cultural dimensions of schooling.***

Rather than thinking of policy as a formal, structural process of "implementation," it might be more fruitful to think of policy as a process of "mediation." The concept of mediated change is anchored in the idea that schools combine the professional norms and values of teachers and administrators with local social, political, and economic conditions. It is a melange of attitudes about teacher and learning, teacher and parent expectations for students, community values, individual and collective ideologies, and the like. Clearly, such values are not readily displaced or dislodged by policy.

To the extent that federal or state policy goals are consonant with local culture, implementation may coincide with policymakers' intentions. Where policy and culture conflict, policy tends to be subverted, redirected, or ignored (Benveniste, 1986; Wildavsky, 1979; Pressman and Wildavsky, 1984; Cuban, 1984). This does not mean that culture cannot be shaped or changed. Certainly, the attitudes of school officials and teachers are subject to various influences. The organizations to which teachers and administrators belong play a role in their professional socialization. They may also have strong allegiances to community and church groups. Teachers, administrators, parents, and community leaders are also influenced by the media.

What is the nexus, then, between the formal institutions of government and local culture? Government can give policies form, but only culture can give them substance. This leads to an alternative formulation of policy implementation—one that views policy not as a set of structured events that lead from definition to implementation, but rather as a process of mediating cultural norms and values that inform policy across different levels of government.

- ***Second, define conceptually both the target population for Chapter 1 and the nature of the services.***

Broadening the target population to include all students in a school is a logical extension of current policy that encourages schoolwide implementation. However, identifying Chapter 1 *schools* instead of Chapter 1 *children* shifts the programmatic focus in significant and important ways and eliminates the more troubling aspects of current practice.

Focusing attention on schools rather than children also eliminates problems associated with current assessment and identification procedures. The object of federal policy is, after all, to improve the competence of schools that serve predominantly poor children. The question that anchors current Chapter 1 policy is how can federal dollars be used to provide compensatory educational services to the lowest-achieving students. The policy question should be reformulated to ask instead: What combination of federal, state, and local resources are needed to build the organizational competence of schools that serve mostly poor, educationally disadvantaged children (Brynelson, 1992).

While policy needs to shift focus from service delivery to organizational capacity building, it must also take into account the demography of the schools that Chapter 1 serves. Poverty, unemployment, crime, mobility, high rates of teenage pregnancy, along with the well-known litany of urban problems, cannot be divorced from educational concerns. Hence, Chapter 1 policy might be expanded to encompass social and health services, as well as economic development.

Compensatory education is bound to have little effect in places like South Central Los Angeles, Detroit, and the District of Columbia, where schooling is clearly not the path to the good life. Consistent with this line of reasoning, then, Chapter 1 policy should not only define schools as the targets of policy, but also help schools define how they can best serve their students.

MODELS FOR CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM DESIGN AND ASSESSMENT

Current Chapter 1 assessment strategies are clearly inadequate to do all that is required of them. They are used for multiple purposes: program eligibility, program assessment and evaluation, student progress, school improvement, state and federal accountability, national student assessment. Program eligibility should not be based on test scores. Funding should target schools, not students.

Similarly, assessment for school accountability should be separated from state and national assessment of student academic progress. The former must focus on whether Chapter 1 schools are effective: Do they provide rich learning experiences? How do they organize curriculum and teaching to maximize student achievement? How do they serve broader student needs? How do they build an organizational culture for learning? How do they extend that culture to their communities? These are certainly richer and more meaningful questions for purposes of assessment and more likely to yield nuanced responses than those that standardized tests provide.

The logical question, then, is: What assessment strategies connect federal policy goals to schools? Are there ways in which assessment policies can shape instructional practices which, in turn, are instrumental in achieving higher levels of educational achievement for economically and educationally disadvantaged students? Such a strategy would certainly broaden the evaluation context from its current narrow focus on student outcomes to a wider organizational focus.

Assessment should address how schools have changed as a result of Chapter 1 support. It would be important to know, for instance, how schools change as a result of parent and community collaboration; what impact Chapter 1 has had on the working environment of schools; to what degree Chapter 1 has prompted schools to alter the content and organization of instruction, curriculum, and testing. Organizational assessment might prompt schools to take a closer look at how they use resources, how they organize themselves, and the like.

In this form, assessment might provide more useful information to both policymakers and practitioners than it does presently. The principal virtue of organizational assessment is that it creates a structural link between policy and practice. It does so by making schools self-conscious about matters of organizational design and purpose.

The accreditation model is an assessment model that integrates accountability, organizational capacity building, and school improvement. It is also consistent with the concept of "mediating" policy, that is, shaping organizational cultures which promote the federal interest in the educational achievement of economically disadvantaged children. The accreditation model can be structured in several ways, including around Chapter 1 technical assistance centers already in operation. Assessment task forces may be regional or statewide. Where this model has been tried, it has proved successful.

The California Community Colleges have used a similar method to evaluate a state-funded program that requires far-reaching and complex organizational changes.[7] Teams composed of community college faculty and administrators, state chancellor's office staff, and faculty from the University of California or California State University system evaluate a college's programs every three years. Similarly, evaluation teams could include staff from Chapter 1 as well as non-Chapter 1 schools, state education agencies, Chapter 1 technical assistance centers, and regional laboratories and faculty from colleges and universities.

The virtues of such an arrangement go beyond assessment. It would create a network that shares ideas, strategies, and more importantly, it would provide a professional anchor for individuals working in Chapter 1 schools. Assessment of Chapter 1 schools would include measures of student progress on various dimensions, the quality and effectiveness of programs, and the like. Evaluation information would be used by the school being evaluated, as well as by state and federal oversight agencies.

California has a similar process of school assessment called program quality reviews. Recently, the state education agency has looked at ways of developing similar program reviews for Chapter 1. There are many ways to structure the evaluation model that is suggested here. What I propose here is intended to be illustrative rather than definitive.

Testing for purposes of national assessment of educational achievement of students who are served by Chapter 1 schools should be separated from assessment for program effectiveness. As suggested earlier, the concomitant use of assessment distorts organizational behavior in ways that undercut effective teaching practices. If national policymakers want to know how well, say, inner-city students are performing academically, that information should be available through such mechanisms as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

---

[7] The program is the "matriculation" mandate enacted by the legislature in 1985. It requires the state's 107 community colleges to provide various services to students in an effort to improve retention and transfer rates.

An additional consideration is the creation of a professional cadre of evaluators, similar to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools in England (*Education Week*, September 9, 1992). The British inspectorate has scrutinized the provision of education in England since 1839. Current policy requires the senior chief inspector to produce an annual report summarizing and commenting on inspections carried out over an academic year. The report may focus from year to year on different dimensions of schools. One year, for instance, the report may concentrate on math and science education; the following year, on language arts and humanities; yet another year, on social studies and geography.

In the United States, inspectors would be well-educated, highly qualified individuals who would evaluate schools for accountability, as well as provide information to them about program quality and effectiveness. Most important, they would neither monitor nor enforce regulations or compliance. No doubt, the specter of a federal or state school inspectorate produces considerable anxiety among some policymakers and school personnel. Much of that anxiety results from some of the excesses and overzealousness of federal program compliance monitors during the 1970s, when enforcement fever was at its height. However, inspection does not carry that kind of baggage in Britain and it need not in this country.

Such an inspectorate could be established at the state level, for instance, or could be connected with the regional laboratories. The key to an evaluation scheme built around an inspectorate is its autonomy and professional expertise.

The accreditation and inspectorate model serve somewhat different ends. The accreditation model is more likely to encourage and develop a community and culture of Chapter 1 schools. By its very nature, it favors technical assistance over accountability. The inspectorate, in contrast, would stress accountability and oversight. Ideally, the two systems complement one another.

The accreditation and inspectorate models satisfy the need to complete the circle of policy intent, instructional practice, and assessment. They do not speak to the broader social and economic issues that entangle educational policy. To address education in the broader context, federal policymakers may also consider disaggregating the monolithic approach that presently characterizes Chapter 1 policy into more targeted and nuanced policy strategies.

For instance, the educational and social problems of destitute children in urban and rural areas obviously differ. Yet, current policy treats them as though they were alike. The needs of inner-city schools and the resources that should be targeted to them differ from those of rural schools. And the socioeconomic and cultural context in which urban and rural schools operate also differ. Consequently, Chapter 1 should have a distinct urban policy that is part of a larger urban strategy. And similarly, a distinct strategy ought to be developed for rural schools.

The conceptual model that I propose embeds Chapter 1 policy into a broader framework for social policy and economic development. It draws on a similar model developed in France.[8]

Through creation of *zones d'education prioritaire* (ZEPs), or education priority zones, the French government targets resources to certain areas of the country which contain children who are identified as being "at risk." These are the children of people living in poverty, the unemployed, those from racial or ethnic minorities, those from one-parent families, and those who have poor mastery of the primary language. Such families, "marginalized from society, or in any case, by-passed by social advances," tend to be grouped together in areas which are described as "at risk."

Under the French system, educational and social problems are addressed through confluent policies.[9] Priority areas are selected to receive resources (in the form of additional teaching positions and operating subsidies) for education. Many of these areas, called *développement social des quartiers* (DSQs), also receive priority assistance for urban renewal and social support for their populations.

In general, policy aims at the convergence of ZEPs and DSQs and stronger partnerships between schools and local authorities (municipalities, general and regional councils, etc.)—that is, the integration of all government-provided public services in an educational policy targeted to social problems.

The convergence of educational and social policy in France, however, is part of a larger urban effort that includes the creation of a Ministry of Cities and a comprehensive city development policy that combines town planning as well as social and cultural development for disadvantaged urban areas. Moreover, policy implementation in France is greatly facilitated through a hierarchically integrated government bureaucracy. While such coordination has proved difficult in a highly fragmented governance system such as ours, conceptually the ZEP and DSQ model may be useful, nonetheless, for federal policymakers.

Problems of scale and diversity create a much more complex policy environment in the United States than in France. That fact argues more persuasively, however, for the need to develop policy that is less monolithic in intent and design and better targeted to diverse educational and social problems. Such a policy approach as the one proposed here also militates for a different approach to program evaluation and assessment.

The French, under the aegis of the inspecteur général, create assessment task forces—similar to the accreditation model described earlier—which provide detailed, comprehensive information about program quality and effectiveness. Program quality is measured by its capacity to shape the academic and social development of students. The instruments used to measure the success of this policy are not those used to measure, for national assessment purposes, the academic achievement of French students.

---

[8] Francine Best, "The educational priority area (ZEP) policy: A response to the 'children-at-risk problem.'" A case study of the Education Priority Area of Alençon-Perseigne. Paris: Inspecteur général de l'Education Nationale, Education Priority Area Assessment Task Force.

[9] Ibid., p. 1.

CONCLUSION

The Hawkins-Stafford amendments signaled an important change in Chapter 1 policy. And though the policy shift was conceptually a positive move toward consonance between program services and student performance, it has fallen short of policymakers' expectations. It perpetuates difficulties that have attended the program since its inception as Title I.

Policymakers have learned a good deal since 1965 about policy implementation. It is a more nuanced and difficult process than had been imagined. While rules and regulations are easily verified and monitored for compliance, changing instructional practices, changing the schools' capacity to serve economically disadvantaged and educationally deprived children is quite another matter. Effecting institutional change that is both far-reaching and broad necessitates a fundamental reconceptualization of current policy. While the Hawkins-Stafford amendments initiated that shift, a more dramatic change is needed.

Policymakers are challenged to design programs and evaluation so as to encourage organizational coherence and integration rather than fragmentation. Policy should create incentives and provide resources for schools to do things not just better, but differently. Accomplishing that requires policymakers to think differently also about the relations between policy and practice. How can policy most effectively mediate organizational change? Moreover, policy must focus on schools as the locus of change. Rather than asking how policy can change students, we should first ask how can policy change schools which serve diverse student needs.

MICHAEL D. USDAN
President, The Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

As the recent tragic events in Los Angeles reflected, the populations serviced by Chapter 1 are engulfed in interrelated social, health, and economic, as well as educational, problems. Indeed, with approximately 40 percent of the children in the nation under six arriving at school from poverty backgrounds or from economic circumstances so marginal that it is tantamount to poverty, the need to develop comprehensive prevention programs becomes more compelling and urgent.

THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

For 30 years or more, Benjamin Bloom and other researchers have stressed the importance of intervening in economically disadvantaged children's lives as early as possible. Indeed, their research indicates that children develop as much from birth to four as they do from four to eighteen, the ages, of course, when they spend most of their time in school.

If children's poverty is growing and pervasive, with well over one-half of the poor youngsters living in suburban and rural areas (not almost exclusively in core cities, which is an all-too-common public misperception), and if early intervention is important and cost-effective, perhaps Chapter 1 should be utilized to a greater extent than it has been to provide more integrated services to children and families.

Since schools have a social penetration, an organizational and physical infrastructure, and an outreach into every neighborhood that are unrivaled by those of other agencies, perhaps through Chapter 1 they can begin to play a more active role in the provision of coordinated and comprehensive social, health, and coordinated services.

Growing numbers of Chapter 1-eligible children and their families are overwhelmed by interrelated social, health, and economic problems—problems that profoundly influence the capacity of the youngsters to succeed in school. For example, their health status and education success are inextricably connected. A child with a painful toothache who has not received dental treatment will not be able to concentrate on his or her studies, nor can a youngster with a vision problem who has not seen a optometrist and cannot see the blackboard be realistically expected to achieve academically.

The framers of *America 2000* (1991) indicate that 91 percent of the lives of youngsters when they reach the age of 18 will have been spent in nonschool settings. Thus, most of the education and socialization of the young obviously takes place in environments which, in growing numbers of cases, overwhelm the capacity of the formal school to compete. In other words, nonschool education forces, particularly in the areas in which Chapter 1 students are served, are probably playing an increasingly powerful, if not dominant, role in the development of youngsters in many (if not most) economically depressed communities.

PROVIDING COORDINATED SERVICES THROUGH CHAPTER 1

Perhaps Chapter 1 resources should be reconfigured significantly to provide the opportunity for schools to become active catalysts in promoting comprehensive parent involvement and related programs that provide holistic, integrated services to needy children and families. It is becoming increasingly apparent as growing numbers of children emanate from disadvantaged socioeconomic environments that the schools will be unable by themselves to handle the complex and interrelated social, economic, and health problems which confront their students, given the current inequitable allocation of state and local resources.

Indeed, a persuasive case can be made that unless our society begins to invest more heavily in learning readiness, our efforts to implement other national education goals and to improve schools may well abort. If school systems and schools serving disadvantaged children are to be held accountable for academic achievement, they will need to be assured that their students receive the requisite social and health, as well as instructional services. For example, Title I funds might be more usefully earmarked to provide supplemental aid for health and social supportive services in some circumstances than for instructional purposes.

The movement to provide more coordinated services is "bubbling up" in localities throughout the country. Limited resources are forcing creative grassroots-based service providers to collaborate in unprecedented ways. Chapter 1, because of its national impact, outreach, and widespread acceptance, could serve as a particularly important lever for promoting greater intersector funding at a time when the plight of families and children is becoming more serious, and more powerful interagency interventions must be created and sustained.

THE MEDICAID PARADIGM

The implementation of recently enacted Medicaid provisions provides an interesting example of the potential that a reconfigured Chapter 1 might have if resources were available to catalyze intersector collaboration between education and other human services. Medicaid provisions, of course, are not truly analogous to federal education aid formulas and programs like Chapter 1: The latter lack pressures comparable to those that Medicaid matching grants and mandates impose on state budgets. Medicaid is cited here only to serve as an example of an increasingly significant program that is providing new opportunities for linkages or connections between schools and other sectors.

In federal FY 1991, for example, Medicaid grew by 20 percent—nearly three times faster than education expenditures. Medicaid, a state-administered program created in 1965 through Title XIX of the Social Security Act, provides health services to the poor. Under recent legislation (Sec. 4719 of the U.S. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990), states can support rehabilitation programs in local school districts for

Medicaid-eligible low-income children. This provision enables school districts to pay for health assessments and treatment programs for needy students.

Medicaid also mandates that participating states provide Early Period Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) Service, which targets poor children and emphasizes prevention. Under this program, states must provide outreach and case management services to high-risk populations. Because services provided under EPSDT need not be provided for Medicaid-eligible adults, resources potentially can be used in school districts to fund special education services, screening, health prevention, and case-management services and outreach.

The possibilities which these relatively recent Medicaid programs provide for school systems to work collaboratively with other agencies reflect still fledgling intersector strategies which will have to be expanded if the escalating needs of poor children and their families are to be met in the demanding years ahead. The reauthorization process offers policymakers a unique opportunity to make Chapter 1 even more flexible and responsive than it is now to the needs of poor children and families. The reconfiguration of Chapter 1 might well be predicated on the counsel recently provided by Professor Michael Kirst (1992) of Stanford University:

> Federal and state funding sources should be designed to meld multiple funding sources together and cut across historically separate children's service domains. This includes hooks, glue money, and blending entitlement dollars with discretionary funds. Funding formulas should not encourage adding functions to schools if other agencies' funds can be used instead.

LINDA F. WINFIELD
Principal Research Scientist
Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

In general, services to disadvantaged students provided by Chapter 1, the federal government's single largest investment in education, are delivered using an in-class or a pullout model staffed by professional teachers or paraprofessionals, or a combination of these approaches. Allington (1990) suggests that the issue of *where* instruction takes place has received more relevance than necessary in the design of Chapter 1 programs and that, in most situations, the regular classroom setting is optimal.

With the growing emphasis on providing regulatory flexibility for local educators and the impending reauthorization of Chapter 1, there is a need to rethink service delivery to guide schools in the selection of various approaches. Opportunities to reshape Chapter 1 services will be lost if we conceptualize alternatives for Chapter 1 delivery only in terms of structural characteristics, such as who provides the Chapter 1 service and where the Chapter 1 service is provided. Different models emerge when we initiate the conceptualization from the student level and work up, as opposed to coming from the top down, that is, district or state level.

THE NEED FOR AN APPROPRIATE MODEL

The selection and design of Chapter 1 services to meet the special needs of disadvantaged students may be subsumed under a more general issue in schools—adapting and providing instruction appropriate to individual students within a group setting (Venezky and Winfield, 1979). Appropriateness consists not only of difficulty level but also includes prior knowledge, strategy usage, skill level, interest, motivation, and other learner characteristics.

For those students who are above the 50th national percentile or on grade level in reading and mathematics, there is a high probability that there will be a match between individual student needs and the instruction received, even though there is diversity within this group in specific learner needs. Moreover, for many of these students, home environment, parental support, and motivation facilitate the schooling process and long-term achievement. These students have ample *opportunity to learn*; that is, they receive the appropriate and timely instruction in specific content, skills, and knowledge. In general, opportunity to learn depends on content coverage, academic engaged time, the quality of teacher-student interaction, and the nature of the academic tasks.

For students who score in the bottom half of the achievement distribution—those likely to be served in Chapter 1 programs—the problem of adapting and providing appropriate instruction is compounded by factors that may not facilitate school learning: the curricular content of the school program, the subject matter, the amount of time available, the person at the school who assumes responsibility for students' learning, and the lack of adequate home support. Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers also vary in the degree of emphasis and coverage of specific concepts and skills provided to students (Winfield, 1987).

In short, the student's *opportunity to learn* is diminished through a series of school structural and organizational constraints. Moreover, extraschool resources, such as parental support or peers (Fordham and Ogbu, 1986), may not facilitate school learning.

Slavin (1987) proposed the QAIT model to capture the essential elements of effective Chapter 1 instruction. This model assumes that students learn new information in relation to the *quality* of their instruction, the *appropriateness* of the difficulty of information to be learned, their level of *incentive* to learn, and the *time* they invest in the learning. Four groups of adults influence an individual student's QAIT and hence the gains in academics and other desired outcomes over time: parents, regular classroom teachers, Chapter 1 instructors, and any other "special school programs" (Stringfield, Winfield, Slavin, and Milsap, 1990).

All four elements must be adequate for instruction to be effective. Chapter 1 programs are assumed to be effective to the extent that they directly and indirectly maximize students' daily and long-term QAIT. This model also assumes that Chapter 1 district- or program-level decisions indirectly affect—through the schools, parents, and Chapter 1 instruction—the overall quality, appropriateness, incentive, and amount of time of instruction which a student receives.

Although the QAIT model provides general components of an effective Chapter 1 program, by itself, it fails to serve as an adequate conceptualization for redesigning alternative delivery systems. First, the components, as specified, are too general and a deeper level of specificity is needed to define quality and appropriateness. For low-achieving students, the congruence among curricula—what is to be taught, in what order, and using what materials—and among methods of instruction, that is, the actual techniques that teachers use to help children learn the curriculum, directly affect QAIT (Allington and Johnston, 1989). Moreover, teacher beliefs about what low-achieving students can accomplish influence instructional behaviors and impact QAIT (Winfield, 1986).

Second, the QAIT model includes incentive as a separate component when it may be a direct outcome of, or at least interact with, quality and appropriateness. Very little is known concerning the long-term effects on students' motivation, perseverance, and attributions which may result from participation in Chapter 1 programs.

Any reconceptualization will have to consider the fact that improving cognitive skills alone may not ensure long-term success of low-achieving students. There is a need to foster adaptive, motivational beliefs and behaviors that will ensure the optimal use and application of these skills as the learning tasks become more difficult and take longer to complete (Bempechat and Ginsburg, 1989). Motivational factors predict academic performance levels more reliably than intelligence factors (Crandall, 1969; Dweck and Licht, 1980). There is a need to identify protective mechanisms at critical intervention points that foster resilience in educational settings (Winfield, 1991a).

Except for individualized instruction or some whole-language approaches, the prevalent model for delivery of Chapter 1 services consists of segregating students into small, homogeneous groups, either in or out of the classroom. According to studies of the effects of classroom composition on motivation (Dar and Resh, 1986), students in homogeneous groups may have a higher academic self-image and learning motivation within that group, but sense of control over learning outcomes may be reduced if there are few opportunities for modeling successful student behavior and learning.

This may be particularly true of Chapter 1 students who are likely also to be in ability-grouped classrooms, Chapter 1-eligible schools, or a community with few academically successful role models. Each of these nested conditions would lead to a higher probability that the students' perceptions of *future payoffs* in academic tasks would be decreased, consequently reducing motivation for school-based tasks. Ogbu (1988) describes this in terms of the job ceiling and limited opportunity structure for caste-like minorities. If instruction is delivered in homogeneous groups, a reconceptualization of the reward structure, the addition of extracurricular activities, and early interventions must be incorporated to increase social bonding and opportunities for students to become invested in conventional activities (Gottfredson, 1990).

Third, the QAIT model must be delineated for various types of students in Chapter 1 programs. McGill-Franzen and Allington (in press) have argued that three erroneous assumptions undergird the most common policy and pedagogical responses to children who experience difficulty in learning to read: first, that children and their families are the problem; second, that specialist teachers and special programs are the solution; third, that children who find learning to read difficult are best served by a "slow it down and make it more concrete" pedagogy.

To their list, I would add a fourth false assumption: that all Chapter 1 students are the same. Although Chapter 1 services are designated for the "neediest" students within a school, all students served are not equally needy. However, students typically receive equal treatment regardless of need because of program and structural constraints at the school or district level; e.g., if there is a Chapter 1 computer lab at the school, all students typically participate.

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

A conceptual framework might specify three levels of student need (Winfield, 1991b): intensive, supportive, and preventive. This categorization assumes a differentiation of student needs at the classroom or school level; it also assumes that multiple indicators—such as attendance patterns, previous performance, teacher judgment, grades, as well as diagnostic, criterion-referenced or norm-referenced standardized test scores—would be used to determine category of learner needs. The emphasis is not to label and categorize students but to identify instructional interventions that effectively meet specific students' needs.

One could envision a system in which level of resources, incentives for teachers, evaluation objectives, and other program components would be differentiated according to these or similar categories which reflect learner needs. For example, students needing "intensive" programs would receive instruction from the best teachers and paraprofessionals who have demonstrated competence with similar populations and a high level of commitment. These teachers might instruct the same students for more than one grade level and receive specific incentives, e.g., additional planning time or time off for professional development, mentor teacher status, or additional salary.

With the flexibility in the Hawkins-Stafford amendments, some schools are attempting to change from the traditional pullout model to alternative service delivery models to accommodate diverse student needs. Based on earlier studies of effective schools, particularly in low-income areas, a whole-school approach resulted in higher achievement outcomes (Venezky and Winfield, 1979; Winfield, 1986). Many schoolwide projects (SWP) in a major urban district have attempted to redesign the instructional organization, in addition to revising curricular approaches, e.g., whole language (Winfield and Stringfield, 1990).

Judgments concerning the effectiveness of various components will have to wait for long-term evaluation results. However, preliminary analysis suggests that students in schoolwide project sites do significantly better than their counterparts in non-SWP sites (Lytle and Davidoff, 1989). Other analyses controlling for beginning level of achievement and of cohorts of students progressing through schoolwide projects found that these students do significantly better in first and second grade, and slightly better in grades four and five than their counterparts in non-SWP sites.

In addition, the growth of students scoring in the bottom quartiles over the period of time spent in schoolwide project sites is slightly better than that of their counterparts in non-SWP sites (Winfield and Hawkins, 1992). The approach in these particular sites included multiple strategies that are coordinated with respect to objectives, instructional method, and responsibility under the auspices of schoolwide projects. Examples of service delivery extrapolated from specific sites which accommodate categories of proposed identified student needs are listed below.

Intensive

Services for children with intensive need include transition classes for first-grade students. The criteria for selection varies from school to school; e.g., students with no prior kindergarten experience, students who have been retained. These classes are reduced in size and provide support for pupils in need of intensive remediation in the basic skills. Pupils may be admitted into and may test out of the transition class as deemed appropriate by the teacher and a pupil support committee. The goal is to move pupils into a regular first-grade classroom.

At one schoolwide project site, classes for concentration on basic skills (COBS) were formed. One class per grade level received a higher concentration of Chapter 1 students. In a team-teaching approach, the regular teacher, a basic skills lead teacher, and a paraprofessional work to provide reading and math instruction to small groups of students.

The majority of schools have used a reduced class size or teacher-student ratio as a strategy for providing instruction to Chapter 1 students. Typically regrouping according to skill level occurs. When students are regrouped, reading instruction may occur outside the regular classroom; however, the classroom teacher who provides the reading instruction becomes the teacher of record for those students. The individual may be a student's regular teacher, a reading teacher, or another teacher at the student's grade level. The point is that the individual who provides the instruction also monitors the student's performance, gives the student the grade, and is responsible for the student's progress. This system minimizes the likelihood that teacher beliefs will shift the responsibility for student learning onto special programs or groups.

In SWP schools, a program support teacher (a newly created position which replaced the Chapter 1 reading teacher) is a master teacher who, in addition to providing staff development, mentoring teachers, monitoring instruction and demonstration lessons, and acting as a consultant, is required to teach a minimum of 90 minutes a day. This individual is the teacher of record for two reading groups. In addition, this individual assists teachers in assessing specific learning problems and preparing individual learning plans, trains classroom aides and parent volunteers, and helps the principal plan and implement the instructional program on a schoolwide basis.

Supportive

Most SWP sites have incorporated after-school homework clubs, to which students experiencing academic difficulty are assigned; tutorials in small groups, taught by a regular classroom teacher who is familiar with the school program, are provided two or three times a week.

The supplementary service centers piloted in three schoolwide projects target students in grades 2 through 5 and their parents so as to increase student achievement (Pugh, 1990). The program includes after-school homework assistance for students, enrichment experiences outside the classroom, and parenting skills. This latter component includes computer-assisted adult literacy and basic skills reinforcement related to homework. In two of the three schools, the program occurs off-site in a local community center.

The Bridges Project in Delaware was not funded by Chapter 1 funds, but served mainly Chapter 1-eligible students in two elementary schools in grades kindergarten through 6. The project focused on the reduction of behavioral and psychosocial problems related to school failure in low-achieving students; however, the program also included an instructional intervention with students, including assistance with homework and one-to-one tutoring (Henry, 1990).

The Bridges Project, which integrated social and mental health services in the school setting, reflects a collaborative effort between a local school district and a nonprofit mental-health agency. The jointly developed design of the intervention consisted of (1) early identification of students, (2) teacher awareness and training in methods for handling students, (3) providing counseling, therapy, and tutoring for identified students at school-site or in home, and (4) providing counseling and family therapy with parents.

Preventive

One SWP site adopted an extended year, adding 22 days to the regular school year so as to reduce retention and enhance skills. The strategy is to build extra time into the regular instructional program so that teachers have the opportunity to provide the additional experiences, prerequisite skills, and reinforcement necessary to enable students to master grade-level material on an ongoing basis. The strategy is to increase instructional time by 10 percent by adding an eleventh month onto the school year, spreading the curriculum over this increased span, and expecting high levels of mastery.

Success for All, a comprehensive program for prekindergarten to third grade has found positive effects on student reading (Slavin et al., 1989). This program, implemented in one schoolwide project site, focuses resources at the early grades to ensure success in basic skills to students the first time they are taught. The major components include (1) trained tutors who work with any student at the time he or she encounters difficulty, (2) a highly structured reading program that regroups students across age lines so that each class contains students at one reading level and uses tutors during reading to reduce group size to 15 to 20, (3) an emphasis on language development in preschool and kindergarten, (4) eight-week assessments, (5) family support teams, (6) a facilitator, and (7) cooperative learning activities.

This commentary suggests alternatives in the delivery of Chapter 1 services based on identifying and differentiating the needs of students. A necessary prerequisite is that classrooms and schools have flexibility in selecting quality interventions, programs, or options to meet specific student needs.

The quality of the intervention, however, will be only as effective as the quality of the personnel involved; therefore, any alternatives will also have to consider fundamental issues, such as pre- and in-service teacher and paraprofessional training, incentives and structures which promote high levels of competence and commitment of Chapter 1 personnel, redefining roles and responsibilities of Chapter 1 personnel, and leadership training in the areas of curriculum and instruction for school principals in Chapter 1-eligible schools.

Chapter Three

ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES

FREDERICK H. BRIGHAM, Jr.
Executive Assistant to the President and Director of Research
National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA)
Washington, D.C.

Since 1965, the Chapter 1 program has assisted several thousand students in non-public schools (NPSs). However, since the *Felton* decision, the number of eligible NPS students receiving these services has declined from 184,000 to 157,500. Yet, the number of eligible students has increased to more than 238,000. We recommend that steps be taken to ensure that all eligible NPS students receive the services to which they are entitled.

The upcoming authorization of the ESEA/ECIA will allow consideration of measures to service all eligible NPS students with appropriate Chapter 1 funding. The possible areas of consideration include the use of:

- Certificates to enable parents to purchase Chapter 1 services for their children
- Third-party contractors to provide Chapter 1 services.

Because the National Catholic Education Association supports the right of parents to educate their children and to obtain compensatory services, no matter what school the children attend, we favor parental certificates for any eligible student. The LEA would be required to provide such certificates when it is unable or unwilling to provide Chapter 1 services to such students. Alternatively, the program could issue direct aid in the form of certificates to all eligible students, or to all eligible NPS students.

The second possible solution to the problem would allow Chapter 1 services to be provided by third-party contractors. This option would require the Secretary of Education, after consultation with appropriate representatives of public and private schools, to establish a baseline of services related to the situation pre-*Felton*.

For this option to be applicable, the Secretary would have to determine, after consultation with appropriate representatives of public and private schools, that there is, in fact, a reduction of NPS student participation and/or provision of services which are comparable and/or appropriate to the needs of eligible NPS students. Under these circumstances and according to current estimates of eligible NPS students and increased funding, the Secretary would be required to remove program, but not fiscal, control from the LEA.

The Secretary would then require the LEA, after due consultation with private school representatives, to request third-party contractors to provide a proposal for appropriate services to include, but not be limited to computer-assisted instruction (CAI), home computers, and other technological delivery options (e.g., video phones, distance learning, mobile vans, or trailers at nonpublic school sites). After a review by the Department, the LEA would award a contract for delivery of services to the third-party contractor most capable of providing services comparable and appropriate to the needs of eligible NPS students.

With respect to capital expenses, we recommend the following:

- Eliminate the authority of the LEA to use capital expense (CE) funds for reimbursement of prior expenses. These CE funds would be used only to:
  - increase the number of unserved NPS students
  - improve the quality of service to underserved NPS students
  - maintain the level of current services to NPS students.
- Redefine or change the existing language to allow CE funds to be used to purchase computers, interactive television, and other educational technology, or to start or strengthen such programs.
- Simplify and standardize the LEA application forms. Nonpublic schools would list what they needed; the federal government would develop common forms.
- Require a "sign-off" on how CE funds are to be used.
- Change SEA factors used to determine LEA needs to reflect new use priorities.
- Require the LEA to maintain a separate account for Chapter 1 funds used to comply with Sec. 1017. This account must provide for the carryover of unused funds to the next fiscal year. Require the LEA to issue an annual report to NPSs on the use of funds.

With respect to consultation, we recommend the following:

- Provide a clear and detailed written definition of what the LEAs' responsibilities are (including fiscal/program decisions) and what remedies are available to NPS officials if this is not done. Consultation should include parents (see Sec. 1016(a) and 1016(c)(5)). We should refer to the Education Division General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), Department of Education (Sec. 100 (b)(652)). The statute should stipulate that there should be no "sign-on/sign-off" without adequate consultation.
- Require the development and use of a mandatory uniform sign-on/sign-off form and specify the NPS authorities to be included (for example, the local NPS administrator or the diocesan administrator for diocesan schools). NPSs would

suggest items to be included in the sign-on/sign-off form and federal authorities would develop a common form.

We also recommend that new legislation:

- Require the LEA to begin Chapter 1 services to all eligible public and nonpublic schools each year on the same day and in no case later than 15 teaching days after the opening of school (not including test days). If this is not possible, the LEA must submit a request to the SEA for a waiver and specify how NPSs are to be compensated during the current school year. NPS authorities must sign off on any agreement.
- Require the LEAs to provide the SEA and NPS authorities evidence that the services and delivery systems that they are providing to NPS students are comparable in effectiveness and efficiency (see Sec. 1019 and 1021).
- Require the SEA to study the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery services and share the results with NPS authorities.
- Maintain the "categorical aid" format for Chapter 1.
- Maintain the requirements that basic grant expenditures for services to NPS students be equal to those of public school students.
- Maintain the requirement for NPS representation on the SEA committee of practitioners.
- Redesign the Even Start program to allow private organizations to be eligible grant recipients.
- Maintain the Chapter 1 State Agency Handicapped Program as a separate program from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Change the funding formula to reflect the percentage of the nation's total population of disabled children served in each state. This would ensure that funds are distributed equally and fairly. State that *Felton* does not apply. There is need to clarify the requirements under Part B concerning handicapped children in sectarian and other NPSs.

CAROLYN HUGHES CHAPMAN
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education, University of Nevada, Reno
Reno, Nevada

GORDON CAWELTI
Executive Director
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
Alexandria, Virginia

Chapter 1 programs have enabled schools with concentrations of children from low-income families to provide additional instructional resources to low-achieving students. The need for such resources has been demonstrated repeatedly by the lower achievement of students from low socioeconomic levels.

CHAPTER 1 AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Some researchers, however, have questioned the ability of schools to influence student achievement. The large-scale study of James Coleman and colleagues (1966) concluded that the strongest variable accounting for student achievement was parents' socioeconomic class. Yet our nation's provision of Chapter 1 resources expresses commitment to the belief that schools can make a difference and to the importance of maximizing the development of our nation's human resources.

Ron Edmonds (1979) and Brookover and others (1979) cite schools where socioeconomically disadvantaged students achieve at comparable levels with their more economically advantaged peers. Unfortunately, such schools, which have come to be identified as effective schools, are still the exception rather than the rule. Wise use of resources provided by Chapter 1 is one way school districts can increase the number of effective schools by enabling large numbers of disadvantaged students to realize their achievement potential.

A strength of Chapter 1 since its inception in 1965 as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been its involvement of parents in identifying the educational needs of their children and planning programs to meet those needs. Recent research (Stedman, 1987, p. 218) demonstrates that parental involvement is a vital component in effective schools.

Edmonds (1979) and Brookover (1979) each found that effective schools were also characterized by teachers' belief that all students could master academic skills. Unfortunately, such a climate of expectation is lacking in many Chapter 1 programs, and evaluation designs for Chapter 1 perpetuate this shortcoming. Evaluation for Chapter 1 identification is based on the NCE scale, which was designed to allow Chapter 1 administrators to compare results from different standardized tests given to students in various grade levels. According to this scale, the hypothetical student who gained one year in achievement for each year of school would maintain the same NCE score from year to year. Such a student would have an NCE gain of zero.

The most widely used Chapter 1 evaluation model compares scores on an achievement pretest with a posttest. NCE gains greater than zero are considered evidence of program effectiveness. This standard does not set high expectations for low-achieving students, however; it merely anticipates that Chapter 1 participation will keep students from falling further behind their peers. "In most cases, the students who score low enough to qualify for services will gain more than zero between pre- and posttesting just because of regression to the mean" (Crawford and Kimball, 1986).

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

The program-improvement initiative that accompanied the 1988 reauthorization of Chapter 1 requires schools to undertake a structured program-improvement process if they do not demonstrate average achievement gains greater than zero (Miller, 1992, p. 32). While seeking to improve the Chapter 1 program is commendable, a much higher standard is needed if low-achieving students are to gain the skills needed to succeed in school.

During its quarter-century of existence, Chapter 1 programming has typically taken students out of their regular classrooms to provide remedial instruction in reading, mathematics, or both. While concentrated instruction in specific skills has usually resulted in NCE gains greater than zero on those skills, the overall benefits to students have been limited by the loss of instructional time in their regular classrooms. Research demonstrates strong relationships between achievement and academic learning time (Wittrock, 1986, p. 298).

Not surprisingly, academically disadvantaged students have difficulty keeping up in subjects that are taught while they are out of their classrooms. Frequently they do not receive sufficient instruction in their pullout settings to offset their loss of instructional time in the classroom (Allington, 1991, p. 11).

A second shortcoming of pullout programs is that they sometimes result in teachers feeling less responsibility for teaching low-achieving students (Winfield, 1986). Classroom teachers, with many other students to teach, may believe that the Chapter 1 teachers have primary responsibility for skills instruction with smaller groups and special materials, while Chapter 1 teachers may view the classroom teachers with whom students spend the majority of their day as the ones primarily responsible for teaching them basic skills. Students lose when no one feels primary responsibility for them.

Recent changes in Chapter 1 regulations have permitted nontraditional programs that add to, rather than take from, the instructional time for academically disadvantaged students. Examples of such nontraditional programming include extended-day programs in which instruction is provided before or after regular school hours. Chapter 1 programs might also provide instruction on Saturdays or during the summer. Other nontraditional Chapter 1 programs that increase the students' learning opportunities are prekindergarten and extended-day or all-day kindergarten programs.

Schoolwide Chapter 1 programs, which may or may not employ pullout classes, are now possible in schools where at least 75 percent of students come from low-income families. Regulations governing schoolwide Chapter 1 programs are designed to encourage overall school improvement by prescribing collaborative planning that includes teachers and parents. A challenge of this school-based planning has been balancing attention to the needs of low-achieving students with attention to overall school improvement. Such school-based shared decisionmaking can promote acceptance of responsibility by all teachers for the education of all students.

These relatively recent changes in federal regulations for Chapter 1 have made it possible for districts to significantly strengthen services to disadvantaged students.

While new federal initiatives permit nontraditional Chapter 1 programming, state agencies responsible for approving program proposals have tended to discourage local districts from implementing nontraditional programs by interpreting the new initiatives conservatively. Additional encouragement from the federal level is needed to ensure that students receive all of the potential benefits of Chapter 1 programs—benefits that will maximize their opportunities to learn by providing increased academic learning time and overcoming the problems of pullout programs.

EXTENDED TIME FOR LEARNING

The success stories of nontraditional programs can encourage decisionmakers at the state and district levels to take advantage of the new federal initiatives for Chapter 1. As one would expect, student achievement gains are greater when total academic learning time is increased by Chapter 1 programming.

In one urban district, evaluators (Elam and Land, 1991) noted that achievement gains for students enrolled in after-school Chapter 1 programs were greater than those of a control group of students in pullout programs, even though their after-school Chapter 1 sessions provided fewer minutes of instruction than the pullout programs. Further examination of the data reveals that the total academic learning time for students in after-school Chapter 1 programs was actually greater because these programs allowed them to participate in a full day of classroom instruction in addition to Chapter 1 instruction.

Prekindergarten and extended-day kindergarten are other ways that Chapter 1 programs have added to the total time available for student learning. Because priorities often need to be set regarding the use of scarce resources, it is interesting to note that longitudinal studies (Sevigny, 1991) in one large, urban district showed that students realized greater long-term benefits from prekindergarten programs than from extended-day kindergarten programs.

Prekindergarten provided instruction for students who otherwise would not have received any instruction, while extended-day kindergarten added to the instructional time of students who were already receiving a half day of kindergarten. Both prekindergarten and extended-day kindergarten have the potential to help the nation move toward the first goal of *America 2000* (1991): All children in America will start school ready to learn.

CONCLUSIONS

Recent changes in Chapter 1 regulations can, indeed, enable districts to provide better educational programs for students from low-income families. But the program improvement efforts need to be strengthened by establishing higher standards to reflect higher expectations for students. Continued research on the effects of nontraditional Chapter 1 programs and dissemination of the findings to decisionmakers at the federal, state, and local levels are needed to promote the extension of successful programs to more students.

The reformulation of Chapter 1 needs to be guided by consideration of such findings, recognizing that relatively few districts have implemented the alternative programs that are possible under current regulations. Rather than creating new initiatives, federal attention is needed to strengthen recent initiatives and overcome resistance to changing programs that have been in place for a quarter of a century. Attention must be focused on the most promising programs—those that increase academic learning time for students, encourage schoolwide improvement efforts, and overcome the well-known liabilities of pullout programs.

KEITH GEIGER

President, National Education Association (NEA)
Washington, D.C.

CHAPTER 1 OVERALL OBJECTIVES

The NEA sees Chapter 1 as an integral component of an effective, comprehensive education system which provides a high-quality education to all students. The 1993 reauthorization presents a unique opportunity to place Chapter 1 in the lead of national education reform efforts.

The federal compensatory education program authorized by Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act constitutes the federal government's largest contribution to public K-12 education. The Chapter 1 program, now in its 26th year, has raised the basic achievement skills of its target population: low-income and educationally disadvantaged students across the country.

The 1993 reauthorization of the Chapter 1 program gives the country a chance to enhance the quality of education offered and the capacity of the program to serve all eligible students. An enhanced fiscal investment and a strengthened national commitment to students who benefit from Chapter 1 programs will ensure that every student meets high standards and that as a nation we reach the national education goals.

As an overall strategy for school improvement, the NEA is committed to building a comprehensive and coordinated public school system which delivers services to all pre-K to grade 12 students—instead of distinct systems of regular education and compensatory education. The NEA believes in a public education system organized and supported to give all students an appropriate education. Such a system would provide a full continuum of program services to fulfill the academic needs of individual students; moreover, it would coordinate with support services to ensure that students are ready to learn.

In NEA's view, the central components of an equitable, systemwide approach to school reform are strategies for improving the achievement of low-performing students. NEA supports the Chapter 1 program as one such strategy and believes Chapter 1 reinforces NEA's broader commitment to school improvement which leads to quality education experiences for all students.

Specific objectives of the Chapter 1 program needing implementation include:

- Improved delivery of educational services, with a special emphasis on professional development
- A full continuum of coordinated support services which lower the barriers to learning
- Appropriate flexibility in policies and practices to allow educators to make critical decisions close to where learning is taking place

- Increased accountability of schools and communities for student outcomes, using improved student assessment tools.

The success and further refinement of the Chapter 1 program is contingent upon maintaining a commitment to close the achievement gap between disadvantaged and advantaged students through interventions based on high expectations of all students. Chapter 1 programs must adopt high standards for teaching and learning--standards that result in knowledge and learning skills that will serve students well as they become productive members of adult society.

To accomplish these goals, NEA recommends that the Chapter 1 program should:

- Enable schools and teachers to address the academic needs of disadvantaged students by integrating their instruction into the regular curriculum
- Allocate sufficient resources to ensure the inclusion of all eligible students and to facilitate support service coordination
- Use appropriate assessments to invite continuous evaluation of the Chapter 1 program and encourage improvement of instructional methods to meet student needs.

INTEGRATION OF SERVICES

To ensure high expectations and high performance standards for all students, there should be no qualitative difference between the education received by Chapter 1 students and that received by regular education students. Chapter 1 programming should emphasize the integration of Chapter 1 services into an enhanced regular curriculum.

Research and practice in schools that are effective with low-income and disadvantaged students support interventions that involve an entire school population. According to a growing consensus among educators, the Chapter 1 program's schoolwide projects are a highly effective strategy for improving low-income and minority student achievement. The effectiveness of these projects lies in their ability to provide a more powerful learning climate through high achievement expectations—a climate that permeates the school and in some cases the community. School organization that shifts decisionmaking about curriculum, instruction, and program planning to school staff and communities has also shown promising results in even the lowest-achieving schools.

A national commitment to supporting an effective educational system must provide sufficient funds for teacher-education programs and local professional growth opportunities. Such programs prepare all teachers to use technology, research, various materials and assessment methods, instructional strategies and curricular adaptations, and processes of collaboration, consultation, and teaming to best advantage in meeting all students' needs.

The NEA believes that the Chapter 1 program can succeed in raising the achievement levels of low-income students only if it is a component of a full continuum of supportive academic and nonacademic services. Several states and counties are examining how to better integrate schools with other community-based human services, with the understanding that schools can't do it alone in the face of increasing family poverty, declining community resources, and expanding family distress of all types. Such integration requires a refocusing of the goals and objectives of human services on the needs of students and their families.

RESOURCES

Service integration also requires resources (e.g., time, money, staff development, and policy changes) which support local efforts directed at eliminating nonacademic barriers to learning. These support services should not shortchange the funds needed for the improvement of academic service delivery, but should be sufficiently funded in their own right.

Chapter 1, like all other federal categorical education programs, is operating with insufficient funds to meet the needs of eligible students. The formulas that guide the resources to the school must be sustained and fully funded. NEA believes that full funding of all categorical programs, coupled with a significant infusion of general education dollars, would facilitate the coordination of bilingual, migrant, vocational, and special education programs at the school site to ensure high-quality education for all students with special needs or diverse interests.

As part of a strengthened national commitment to education, the Chapter 1 program must increase its investment in professional development for both school staff and administrators to ensure high program quality and effective school management. Innovative instruction, locally selected assessment methods, strong parent and community involvement, reliable central office support for organizational and instructional development, and the elimination of the "Chapter 1 student" stigma all require substantial training and retraining of new and veteran teachers and administrators.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

Like many other categorically funded programs, Chapter 1 programs must identify the continuing needs of each eligible student, as well as areas of the program needing improvement. Appropriate assessment methods and tools must be developed for these purposes.

The program improvement provisions outlined in the 1988 Chapter 1 law require substantial overhaul to reflect high performance standards for all students, to encourage schools to participate in improvement processes, and to reward schools' success in reaching high educational goals. When identifying schools needing intervention, NEA encourages the use of locally selected assessment measures which look beyond student achievement to the school and the school system. In addition, the identification of schools for improvement should be made as close to the school level as possible.

These assessment measures must also encourage curricular and instructional improvements which enhance students' skills and capacity to learn. The upcoming Chapter 1 reauthorization offers a perfect opportunity to demonstrate the advantages of authentic forms of assessment, thereby substantially minimizing the use of nationally normed standardized tests to monitor student progress or to evaluate the quality of school programs.

States and local districts are making progress on developing alternative assessments which could be used to give teachers, parents, and program evaluators a more meaningful, valid picture of what children know and need to learn. Any assessment systems used in the Chapter 1 program should:

- Set school delivery standards, such as class size, to ensure that school systems are held accountable for program success or failure
- Be based on content standards developed with subject matter associations, with special attention to enhanced reading and math competencies for Chapter 1 students
- Rely on local research and validation before being used nationally
- Be selected by professional educators from a validated pool of assessment measures rather than mandated from the state or national levels.

A STRONGER NATIONAL COMMITMENT

Education must be part of a broader, integrated system that includes early childhood development programs and a full spectrum of health and social services designed to eliminate nonacademic barriers to learning. Such a system requires a much stronger national commitment to children, families, and education than now exists.

The Chapter 1 program cannot stand alone in closing the achievement gap between low-income and affluent, nonwhite and white students. The program must be part of an educational system that has high achievement expectations for all students; holds teachers to high professional standards; enables parents to participate fully in their children's education; and supplies the funds, physical resources, and flexibility to make school success possible.

EDWARD P. KELLER
Deputy Executive Director
National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
Alexandria, Virginia

We offer below comments reflecting what we have heard in general terms from our members, elementary and middle school principals. Their comments are basically these:

- Fully fund the program so that all eligible children may be served and that the depth of the service need not be sacrificed for the breadth and vice versa. Our members continually remind us how much could be done if Chapter 1 were fully funded.
- Keep the program flexible. Opportunities, such as schoolwide programs and others pointed out in a recent Department of Education publication, have increased over the past several years. That trend needs to be encouraged.
- Strengthen professional development. As more and more programs move away from pullout methods to in-class processes, the need for continuing professional development increases.
- Help the transition from Head Start programs to school by supporting networking activities and preschool programs.
- Include encouragement and support for parent involvement and parenting activities, such as the parenting education components of the parents-as-teachers program.
- Support the coordination of health and human services programs with education. Let's be able to determine all the agencies and services affecting a single child and build a coordinated, cohesive approach to meeting child and family needs.
- Leave the issue of choice to local school districts to determine.
- Provide for dissemination at federal and state levels of successful Chapter 1 practices.
- Recognize the rising tide of poverty in rural areas and permit some risk taking with variances as needed for selected programs. These could be treated as "pilot projects" with sound accountability measures to assess student and staff progress; they will need time to have an effect. Everything can't be measured and concluded in three-year cycles.
- Examine what tests are used for what purposes in Chapter 1 and develop criteria so that tests and test results are used for appropriate purposes.

RICHARD M. LONG

Government Relations Specialist
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
Washington, D.C.

We believe that the current educational system reflects obsolete needs of the industrial age. New goals for restructuring education need to be developed—goals that include opportunity for all and emphasize every person's right to mathematical literacy, access to lifelong learning, and participation in an informed electorate. We believe that Chapter 1 should be changed to reflect a broader view of education, in general, and mathematics education, in particular, to support our goal of ensuring that every person is mathematically literate. To achieve these ends, we suggest the following.

First, the goals outlined in NCTM's *Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics* should apply to all students. We believe that successful programs will build their curricula on these agreed-upon *Standards*. Often, this does not seem to be the case in Chapter 1 classrooms. NCTM recommends that the leaders of Chapter 1 design their mathematics programs using the goals and processes of the *Standards*.

Second, to accomplish the first point, NCTM believes that Chapter 1 will need to be reorganized to stress:

- Better coordination between regular school programs and Chapter 1
- Better professional development programs for teachers and other staff involved in Chapter 1
- The development of assessment programs for instructional goals, rather than simply student placement in the program.

Third, to implement the *Standards*, we believe that the leadership at both the national and state levels needs to reflect a broader professional background. Currently, none of the state coordinators of Chapter 1 and none of the federal leaders in the U.S. Department of Education with direct responsibility for Chapter 1 have a mathematics education background. We recommend that this be changed.

Fourth, NCTM is concerned that in order to make mathematics more interesting to disadvantaged elementary school students, Chapter 1 program coordinators should:

- Utilize professional teachers with a background in mathematics education
- Make use of the *Standards* in designing school programs
- Reach out to parents with specific programs to adjust their understanding of mathematics to reflect the use of math in daily life, not merely "doing long division," as their memories might suggest.

Fifth, NCTM is concerned that the assessment system used for Chapter 1 is not providing the information needed by classroom and compensatory education teachers to improve instruction. NCTM suggests that:

- Assessment programs be changed to emphasize teacher evaluations of students
- Assessment programs aimed at providing information relevant to instruction be developed
- Teachers and administrators be instructed with respect to using a new assessment system for Chapter 1 as suggested in the two points immediately above.

Sixth, NCTM is concerned about the number and type of instructional models used for Chapter 1. Currently, many Chapter 1 programs are designed to meet audit requirements rather than instructional needs. Therefore, we encourage the federal government to reiterate to local schools that they may develop alternative structures for instruction, such as parent programs, the use of Saturday programs, pre-K programs, or other nontraditional approaches. The actual design of instruction must reflect a new set of goals as outlined in the *Standards.* We believe that Chapter 1 must take the lead in making use of new and innovative instructional programs.

Chapter 1 needs to be recognized as an integral part of the educational restructuring movement so that every student has access to a quality education. One of our national goals is to strengthen mathematics education; however, we have yet to commit ourselves as a nation to making that goal a reality. By changing Chapter 1 to reflect the *Standards,* the program will not only improve the teaching and learning of mathematics, but also improve the learning of other subjects, because the *Standards* emphasize problem solving and thinking. The goal of the *Standards* is not only to produce more mathematicians; it is to enable people to successfully participate in our increasingly complex and demanding world.

RICHARD D. MILLER

Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
Arlington, Virginia

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA), along with the rest of the education community, solicited comments from our members on how Chapter 1 and the entire Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) might be changed by the 103rd Congress.

Six regional forums, held in January and February 1992, discussed three specific questions:

- Under what conditions can all children learn?
- What can local school communities do to ensure these necessary conditions?
- What can the federal government do to ensure these necessary conditions?

The following themes emerged from these regional forums:

- Everyone in the school system must accept the view that all children can learn. To be ready for children, schools should work with the larger community to provide school programs for children with special health and/or social needs.
- Assessment systems that promote learning must be developed. Unfortunately, the usual goal of assessments is to sort and separate children. In its 1988 amendments to ESEA, Congress decided to use standardized tests, given by the state agency, to find out which schools needed "program improvement." All advocates of that assessment tool now recognize that it only labeled schools, staff, parents and children in the program-improvement schools as being an "underclass" in education. The proper use of assessment is one of AASA's principal concerns.
- Barriers between the community, teachers, and schools must be broken down to ensure that all are cooperating to meet student needs.
- Funding for schools must shift away from reliance on the local property tax. Education funding must be a priority at all levels of government. Perhaps a trust fund (The Children's Investment Trust S.1073, introduced by Senator Dodd of Connecticut) should be established to ensure that all children's needs will be met.
- Continuous improvement must be sought through professional staff development in real, working school settings.
- Businesses should provide parents with leave time from work so that they may participate in school-related activities.
- The federal government should design its program for children by looking at the "whole child," whether that child be abused, hungry, immigrant, disabled, or in poor health. To adequately treat the needs of children, Congress should allow

funds for various categories of programs to be blended. Children are not compartments and should not be treated as such.

- The federal government should make its regulations governing programs for children more flexible, encourage innovation, and report what is happening in successful education programs in America's schools. Federal programs must be fully funded if they are to have an impact across the country. Finally, the funds must flow to public schools only, otherwise the government will violate the U.S. Constitution, which strictly separates the activities of churches and the state.

AASA is extremely interested in a program that will allow schoolwide use of Chapter 1 funds, rather than targeting only the Chapter 1-eligible child. When 66 percent of a school's students become eligible, may not the other 34 percent need services also? Such services could be provided more effectively and efficiently on a schoolwide basis than individually.

MONTY NEILL

Associate Director, FairTest
(National Center for Fair and Open Testing)
Cambridge, Massachusetts

The reliance on standardized, norm-referenced, multiple-choice testing (henceforth, standardized tests) in Chapter 1 is one of the major problems in the program.[1] These tests are used to determine entry into the program (once income-eligibility has been established), exit from the program, and continued eligibility of programs to receive Chapter 1 funds; they are used also to measure individual progress in the program, to evaluate programs, districts, and states, and to establish grounds for intervention and sanctions.

Standardized tests are inadequate for all of these purposes. Moreover, their importance in the program has had perverse effects on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. These effects have contributed to the general failure of Chapter 1 students to attain acceptable academic outcomes.

Typically, Chapter 1 students fall further and further behind their age peers and never establish an educational base that will allow them to be self-sufficient lifelong learners or to enroll in postsecondary educational programs. In large part this is because the programs inappropriately separate "basic" from "higher-order" skills, then focus on the former through forms of drill that are little more than continuous test coaching.

Coaching for standardized tests may enhance scores in the short run, but it cannot provide a solid educational foundation. Testing is not the sole cause of the widespread belief in the behaviorist conceptions of learning, instruction, and content that underlies the drill approach. However, testing reinforces, justifies, and makes this counterproductive approach nearly unavoidable.

FairTest recommends the elimination of standardized tests from the Chapter 1 program because they (1) provide inadequate and often erroneous information for making important decisions and (2) have destructive effects on student learning. If the federal government will not ban their use, then at a minimum it should not require them. We will discuss the reasons for ending standardized testing in Chapter 1 and what should be done instead in six categories: eligibility, accountability, individual learning, program evaluation, individual progress, and sanctions. We will conclude with a suggestion for making assessment in Chapter 1 accountable and educationally helpful.

---

[1] The arguments against standardized testing presented in this commentary are summarized, with detailed references, in Medina and Neill, *Fallout from the Testing Explosion* (FairTest, 1990). See also, Neill and Medina, "Standardized testing: Harmful to educational health" (*Phi Delta Kappan*, May 1989), and Neill, "Standardized Testing: Harmful to Civil Rights" (paper for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1989; in press). The proposals for Chapter 1 assessment draw on draft papers from the Commission on Chapter 1 and a critical commentary submitted by FairTest to the Commission members. The discussion of performance assessments relies on an extensive set of published and unpublished materials, for which FairTest has a bibliography.

ELIGIBILITY

Current law requires "objective" criteria for admission to Chapter 1. Typically this is interpreted as mandating the use of test scores. Combined with the current requirement for annual testing to measure progress, this causes most districts to test all students in order to select low-scoring students for services. The process fails to ensure that services are provided as and when needed. For example, one student may need short intensive intervention, while another may need regular but not intensive help. But Chapter 1 currently uses test scores to determine whether a student is simply in or out, not to help identify and provide the particular help a student needs.

An alternative to the use of standardized tests is simple: Based on whatever funding formulas are authorized, students in a school receiving Chapter 1 funds should receive services based on determinations of academic need by teachers and other staff. Such determinations should meet defined criteria that teachers would follow to ensure fair and reasonable use of resources.

Program eligibility for Chapter 1 funds also should not be based on test scores. For example, the current procedure whereby programs in which students make substantial test-score gains can be denied continued funding must be eliminated. As it now works, funding denial based on test-score gains perversely penalizes schools for success. The withdrawal of funds based on one group's test-score gains can be used to deny needed resources to a future group of students. Programs should be awarded and continue to receive funding based on poverty criteria, not test scores.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Standardized tests should not determine individual and program progress. The two main problems with using the tests for these purposes stem from their very nature: They are norm-referenced and they are multiple-choice. In combination, these two characteristics are particularly harmful, but either one would render them poor instruments for determining individual or group progress.

The primary purpose of norm-referenced testing is to sort students relative to one another on a curve, not to establish whether students have attained any specific learning goals. Thus, the results fail to inform the public about actual student learning. A better alternative is to determine what students need to know and be able to do across a curriculum (that is, establish criteria or standards) and then assess whether students have met those standards.

Rather than establishing the criteria for all students, the federal government should approve or disapprove state standards or state plans for assuring adequate local standards. Thus, a state would submit to the U.S. Secretary of Education either the criteria to which it will directly hold students and programs (state standards) or the criteria to which it will hold local districts for establishing acceptable standards (state-approved local standards). These standards inevitably will vary, but they can themselves be held to acceptable levels of quality under guidelines established by the Secretary.

To know whether Chapter 1 students are meeting the standards or are making adequate progress requires appropriate methods of assessment. The assessments must be criterion-based to reflect the standards, and they must not be multiple-choice: The multiple-choice format lacks content validity for any subject area (never mind the thematic or cross-disciplinary work); moreover, the format's effects on curriculum and instruction make it instructionally harmful if the role of multiple-choice tests in evaluation is significant.

No subject area can be validly reduced to a set of one-right-answer questions and isolated, discrete facts and skills, both of which are inherent in the multiple-choice format. A content-valid assessment must reflect more comprehensively the nature of the subject area. Substantial research has shown that teaching to the test crowds out content that is not tested (both other subject areas and aspects of the covered areas, such as problem solving) and controls classroom instruction. Instruction comes to resemble the tests: centrally controlled, atomized, one-right-answer, repetitive-drill exercises. The domination of multiple-choice testing ensures that higher-order thinking processes will not be developed.

To ensure proper assessment practices, including valid and helpful instruments, the uses of assessment must be carefully and consistently distinguished. For Chapter 1, they are threefold: individual learning assistance, program evaluation, and individual progress toward meeting the standards.

INDIVIDUAL LEARNING

Providing useful information to help students learn is the most important assessment activity and the one for which standardized tests are the most useless. The tests do not provide meaningful information to teachers because they fail to help uncover the student's thinking processes. For example, if a third grader cannot multiply single-digit numbers, an appropriate learning goal for most third graders, the test does not help teacher or student know why the student cannot multiply. In contrast, the kinds of assessments that will help teachers better meet student needs are grounded in classroom activity. They require observation, inquiry, documentation, and analysis.

The inability of most teachers to use these strategies seems to be based on two problems: They never learned to assess in this way, and they do not follow classroom practices that allow for or require these assessment approaches. The solution is staff development that integrates curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and school restructuring that supports these practices.

Thus, Chapter 1 should provide substantial resources to allow for the development of learner-centered school practices, including assessment, through staff development and school restructuring. Many schools are working on precisely such methods of assessments, involving observation, documentation, portfolios, and projects, sometimes with state assistance.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluating programs requires an altogether different strategy. Heretofore, Chapter 1 has relied on aggregating individual test scores to provide program scores. This dual-purpose use of the tests has effectively given control over Chapter 1 programs to tests that are instructionally harmful and content-invalid. To avoid this problem, program quality and individual progress must be conceptually separated and measured in different ways.

This does not mean that an assessment can never serve both purposes; it means, rather, that its ability to do so cannot be simply assumed. The effects of using one assessment for multiple purposes also must be carefully monitored. Two options appear possible:

- Use external, on-demand assessments on a sampling basis to obtain program information. These might also provide instructionally useful information, but would leave individual progress information up to schools.
- Extract information from individual student performance in targeted areas by sampling from classroom products, but enable program evaluation purposes to remain subordinate to the individual assessment purposes.

Both approaches have positive aspects and potential drawbacks. They can be used in tandem.

The value of sampling is that much information on programs can be obtained relatively efficiently while reducing the pressure to teach to the test. Sampling with on-demand instruments could use several methods, for example, a matrix approach, such as that used by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The test might mix performance and multiple-choice or short-answer items, but because it represents the standards which students are seeking to attain, it should contain only a small percentage of multiple-choice or short-answer questions.

Another sampling approach, Arizona's K-12 performance assessments, uses multiple forms of a given subject and grade assessment. This is sampling in that the forms are broadly comparable, but not strictly equatable. They provide information about individuals that may be instructionally useful, but do not provide equatable individual progress scores; and they provide program information at the school or district level. They are not administered in every grade, but once every several years.

An alternative approach is to extract from ongoing student work the information needed to ascertain program quality. (The extraction is itself a form of sampling.)

Vermont has adopted a portfolio approach that will, in the near future, provide data at the district level. In two grades and two subjects, teachers obtain portfolio information from classroom work. Using rubrics set by the state that cover learning goals in the subjects (such as the ability to communicate in math), the portfolios are scored by classroom teachers for their own students. For program purposes, they are scored a second time by groups of teachers from other schools and then returned to the teachers.

An approach that combines elements of on-demand and portfolio assessment is the creation of curriculum-embedded tasks, which is being undertaken in Connecticut and California. These tasks, created outside the classroom, are scored first by teachers for their own students as part of the curriculum and second by external scorers (usually other teachers). Information can be provided on individuals or programs.

While the Vermont portfolio approach allows teachers, or even students, to design the tasks assembled in the portfolio (though model tasks are made available to teachers), the curriculum-embedded approach emphasizes externally designed tasks. However, as teachers and students became familiar with them, they would be expected to create additional tasks. Thus, the curriculum-embedded approach may be considered as a path toward classroom-based portfolios and projects.

The values of the portfolio extraction approach include integration with curriculum and not being limited by the particular time and format constraints of on-demand exams. The dangers include narrowing and controlling the curriculum by spending inordinate time on the few pieces for the portfolio that will be scored, or even teachers or parents doing the work that is to be scored.

INDIVIDUAL PROGRESS

The purpose of Chapter 1 is to assist students to make substantial progress in learning. Assessments to assist learning are thus essential. Students, parents, schools and communities also have a right to know whether students are making progress.

However, this right does not mean that the state must directly determine the progress of each individual by testing and obtaining an equatable score. Rather, assessment of and reporting on individual progress is the job of the program and the district. Typically, schools report individual student progress to parents. If in-class assessing improves along with curriculum and instruction, then the quality of information provided to parents should improve, as should the actual student outcomes.

The state should assume that if the state sampling determines the program quality to be acceptable, then the determination of individual progress can be safely left to the program. This approach should be explicitly allowed by Chapter 1 reauthorization language.

If district results on the state sampling are not acceptable, then the state has a duty to determine the cause of the problem and help to construct an educational program that will enable students to meet the standards (see "Sanctions," below). However, this need not require that the state replace the district in ascertaining the progress of each individual student. That is, state intervention should not necessarily require additional testing of individuals.

Additional testing is unlikely to serve any useful purpose. It will not assist instruction or help the individuals make progress. Extra assessment is wasteful and possibly damaging to both curriculum and instruction.

For states that have assessments of each individual that provide equatable individual scores, those assessments can provide direct information on each individual. However, no state now has such a performance assessment, though California and Kentucky have been legislatively mandated to create them (both will include some multiple-choice items). For Chapter 1 purposes, this approach should be discouraged. It would present difficult technical problems, such as equating many secret, complex, multidimensional tasks across forms and longitudinally.

Even if the technical problems could be overcome, the cost to assess every student with a performance exam that is valid and reliable may be more than states are willing to pay. In that case, they will have to choose between using primarily multiple-choice or short-answer simplistic tests, or going to one of the forms of sampling, as in NAEP, Arizona, and Vermont. A reversion to simplistic testing will lead back to a narrow, test-driven curriculum and similarly reduced student learning. In sum, Chapter 1 should not require state or federal assessments to provide data on each student served by Chapter 1.

A related issue, pertaining to both individual and program progress, is that of performance levels. Currently, normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains represent levels of progress for individuals, programs, and states, but do so without any standards. Some proposals for Chapter 1 assessment reform have suggested setting various levels to measure student progress, such as the NAEP categories of basic, proficient, and advanced.

Fine-tuned levels are likely to be even harder to set for performance assessments than they have been for the NAEP items. Vermont scores each category from 1 to 4 in its rubrics for math and writing; these can be aggregated for individuals and groups. Whether they would stand up to the sort of rigorous scrutiny to which NAEP has been subjected remains to be seen. In any event, the evident complexity and difficulty of the process leads us to recommend that states not be required to set several levels.

Sanctions

The remaining use of test scores that needs correction is sanctions. Under the current law, failure to make progress on NCE scores renders a district vulnerable to state improvement plans; however, this provision is rarely used. The functional meaning of improvement becomes the raising of scores on invalid multiple-choice exams through intensified test coaching. This, too, must be changed.

We recommend that programs that do not demonstrate an acceptable level of performance on the assessments be investigated by a state team. The team, or inspectorate, would determine the reason for the problems and recommend state and local steps to overcome them. If the district failed to correct problems that it should have the capability to solve, then the state might take control of the district's Chapter 1 program. In any event, scores on tests should not be the sole basis for sanctions, but simply trigger an investigation: Assessments alone cannot explain the causes of educational problems.

Educational Assessment Impact Statement

The need to rethink Chapter 1 assessment arises in large part because testing is itself unaccountable. While eliminating reliance on standardized tests and using sampling to obtain program information should substantially improve matters, there are still no mechanisms for ensuring that assessment systems are fair and unbiased, accurate, and educationally helpful.

FairTest proposes development of an educational assessment impact statement (EAIS) process to be used to help ensure that assessment and testing programs are accountable. Modeled on the successful environmental impact statement, this process would require assessment users, such as states, to develop an open process for designing, implementing, and evaluating their assessment systems.

Under the proposal, a state would have to demonstrate through an EAIS that the assessment system is fair, valid, and educationally beneficial. The state would notify the public through aggressive outreach to impacted constituencies, particularly to parents; hold public hearings and solicit broad input from experts and lay people; submit a draft proposal for public discussion; review proposed alternatives; and only then submit an assessment plan for approval by the Department of Education for use in Chapter 1. Each state would be required to review its assessment system periodically in light of its performance and changes in educational goals.

NATIONAL DATA

National test data for Chapter 1 currently are derived from aggregating NCE scores from individual to local to state to national. Under the proposals suggested here, this aggregation would no longer be possible. As with states, sampling would provide sufficient national information. Options for obtaining national information include (1) developing an NAEP subsample of Chapter 1 participants, including Chapter 1 samples in various existing national longitudinal studies; (2) developing a special Chapter 1 national sampling test; or (3) finding ways to extract comparable information from each state.

The first two are probably the easiest and least expensive, though problems exist with each. For example, the achievement levels thus far set for NAEP raise serious validity questions. There seems little reason to construct a separate exam, probably parallel to NAEP, just for Chapter 1, when using NAEP or longitudinal studies would enable comparisons between students in Chapter 1 and those who are not. Nor is there any reason to believe a new exam would be better.

The final option sets a task akin to that posed by the New Standards Project, though perhaps more difficult, as no state in this Chapter 1 model would feel pressed to produce the same type of data as other states. Technically, this could probably not be done within the time covered by the coming reauthorization. Work on this possibility is probably best left to such efforts as New Standards or the Assessment Consortia of the Council of Chief State School Officers.

CONCLUSION

The most important contribution to assessment reform that Congress can make in reauthorizing ESEA is to remove all requirements for norm-referenced testing. Second, Congress can require that schools and districts receiving funds implement classroom-based performance assessments useful for enhancing instruction and learning. This will necessitate staff development so that teachers can make use of the new assessments together with high-quality curriculum. Congress should recommend that states use sampling techniques for program accountability purposes, backed up with various forms of intervention where districts need help. Assessment for accountability should not be allowed to undermine assessment for instruction and learning. Finally, assessment systems must themselves be held accountable through mechanisms such as FairTest's proposed educational assessment impact statement.

CHRIS PIPHO

State Relations Director
Education Commission of the States (ECS)
Denver, Colorado

Because the Education Commission of the States (ECS) works only infrequently with Chapter 1 programs, our responses are somewhat limited. ECS does, however, encourage all programs to adopt practices that are best for children, and we would support any recommendations that focus less on regulation and more on improving learning for all children. Our specific recommendations follow:

- On-site reviews are currently more concerned with paperwork and compliance than with program quality. This focus needs to be reversed.
- The current requirement that allows Chapter 1 equipment to be used by non-Chapter 1 students for 10 percent of the time is restrictive. Chapter 1 students obviously should have access whenever they require or request it, but other students should also be able to use idle equipment without cumbersome monitoring and rental procedures.
- Current practice dictates that a program must request a waiver to combine any Chapter 1 funds with other programs. Better practice would allow combining Chapter 1 funds with other moneys to produce a quality program.
- Much staff time is spent recording and collecting data that do not actually need to be submitted but must be kept on file for site visits. The time could be better spent on evaluating the program and collecting data that are required to be submitted.
- Many of the regulations at the state level allow little flexibility and do not speak to what is best for children. Even when formal steps are taken to relax regulations, staff monitoring "compliance" often demonstrate the ability to maintain the original rigidity.
- The criterion of "educationally deprived" for preschool children is based on performance and does not allow for such factors as family, etc. If a child performs adequately academically, that child may not participate. Poor performance is not the only indicator of deprivation or need.
- Private schools need only "sign off" on the paperwork submitted by public districts. If parochial schools don't have enough students for a full program but have a few who qualify, the public district must provide the program for those children. Those districts cannot, however, send students from a building not meeting the eligibility requirements to a building that does meet the requirements. It would seem appropriate to have all regulations equal.
- The "incidental inclusion" clause in the new Federal Register does not adequately define "incidental." Districts fearing "noncompliance" will probably forgo incidental contacts unless they can be assured that what they call "incidental" meets the monitoring agency's definition.

ALBERT SHANKER
President, American Federation of Teachers (AFT)
Washington, D.C.

The AFT will present a comprehensive, official policy statement to the 103rd Congress as it proceeds with the reauthorization of Chapter 1. Our preliminary comments follow.

RESOURCES

Changes in the Existing Formula

The implications of the shift from 1980 to 1990 census data loom large in the reauthorization of Chapter 1. That shift will redirect massive amounts of federal funds from major northeastern and midwestern cities to the growth areas of the south and the western sunbelt. Those northeastern and midwestern cities cannot withstand the blow. The Chapter 1 formula therefore must be changed to place more money in concentration grants, or new formula factors must be added to overcome the problem. Areas (and schools) with the greatest concentrations of low-income children have overwhelming needs that even now are not being adequately met by Chapter 1. A reduction of funds would be fatal.

Chapter 1 as a School Finance Lever

As RAND correctly points out, with federal aid at about 6 percent of elementary and secondary education expenditures, Chapter 1 does not have a large enough tail to wag the dog of school finance equalization. It is reasonable, however, to require that Chapter 1 comparability provisions be enforced to ensure that Chapter 1 schools receive their full share of state and local resources. As we develop our official position on reauthorization, we, too, will be wrestling with the issue of how to encourage equalization—that is, the kind of equalization that adds money to poor districts and schools without depressing other districts and schools and encouraging perverse effects.

There also seems to be talk of using Chapter 1 as a lever for interstate equalization. We certainly have an interest in seeing low-spending states spend more on education to improve achievement. But we have no interest in a conception of interstate equalization that would reward low-spending states by punishing high-spending states for their efforts.

Chapter 1 and Other Categorical Aid

One of the best ways of increasing the coordination between Chapter 1 and other federal and state categorical programs is through schoolwide projects (more on this later). In principle, all available and relevant federal, state, and local resources should be brought to bear on the *total* Chapter 1 child. The best way to do that is to let the people at the school level figure out how best to spend the moneys to provide a cohesive program that addresses the children's various needs.

The biggest problem we see at this point relative to coordination is special education. Because of the huge costs of special education and the measly funding levels associated with P.L. 94-142, special education is eating into everything, including Chapter 1, we hear. Chapter 1 can be used for low-income special education children but should not be a substitute for funding special education. The point is that there is a desperate need to fund special education mandates adequately. Without that, and if what we hear about raiding other programs to cope with special education is correct, better "coordination" between Chapter 1 and special education may create the wrong incentives.

LOCAL SERVICES

Supplemental Services

The emphasis on supplemental services for Chapter 1 children is correct, but by and large the implementation has been poor. There is by now a long tradition of responding to the supplementing requirement through pullout programs. Indeed, this is so deeply ingrained that many Chapter 1 personnel at the state, district, and school levels tell you that pullouts are *required.*

There are certainly some good pullout programs in which considerable attention has been given to scheduling in a way that does not cause the child to miss out on important, regular classroom activities. On the other hand, missing out on anything in the regular class is a form of supplanting, and being pulled out is stigmatizing. The response to this and related problems is not to de-emphasize supplemental services, as that would likely encourage districts to cut back on funding to Chapter 1 schools. The response is to increase the range of and knowledge about alternative practices and to improve implementation; these are not easy tasks.

We shall be investigating several strategies in this regard, including the following:

- ***First, reduce the 75 percent low-income threshold for schoolwide projects to at least 60 percent, encourage more experimentation in program offerings, and extend funding for schoolwide projects from 3 to 5 years (with evaluations to prompt interim corrections).***

While there is unevenness in schoolwide projects, they are the best bet for overcoming the labeling and fragmentation problems associated with Chapter 1 and for encouraging more educationally sound practices.

- ***Second, if state education departments are to continue to have a large voice in local Chapter 1 programs, then they need to have a much better understanding of the law and what it does and does not permit.***

There is a tendency to look askance at anything that does not look like a conventional Chapter 1 program, and the result is to squash local initiatives. In general, the state has too great a role in regulating Chapter 1, and our reports indicate that, by and large, it does not discharge that role well. Not only do the states tend to reify the status quo in the program, they are also responsible for generating huge and meaningless paperwork requirements.

- ***Third, local districts need lots of help to redesign Chapter 1 programs to incorporate proven (not faddish) practices and models and to discard those which are not working well.***

Since state Chapter 1 officials would need lots of technical assistance themselves in order to help local districts, we are not sure they are the best sources of help. Moreover, we have only a thin knowledge base on effective Chapter 1 practices and models, and programs that may have worked only in a particular context are frequently sold as having universal applicability and are imposed on practitioners. More research, development and dissemination specific to the needs of Chapter 1 children should be considered and far greater quality control required in all parts of the system.

- ***Last, but not least—in fact, this should be one of the highest priorities for Chapter 1 reauthorization—the knowledge and skills of staff (teachers and paraprofessionals) who work with Chapter 1 children should be improved.***

There is not enough staff development; its quality—substance, duration, follow-up—is often poor; and its structure tends to work against whole-school staff development. Moreover, paraprofessionals tend to be ignored, although they are a major and important ingredient of Chapter 1 programs. Quality staff development is absolutely essential to improving Chapter 1.

Facilitate Schoolwide Improvement

As should be evident by now, we are extremely encouraged by schoolwide projects and believe that their benefits, actual and potential, would be extended by lowering the eligibility threshold. Safeguards must be incorporated to ensure that the needs of the most educationally disadvantaged students are being met. Moreover, it is crucial to continue the requirement that these schools be funded at no less a level than other schools in the district.

Our experience thus far suggests that schoolwide projects work best when there is staff development and technical assistance; when there is a responsible shared decisionmaking approach involving teams of teachers, parents, administrators and, at the secondary level, students; and when the schools are allowed to look at the totality of their funds in a comprehensive (as opposed to categorical) fashion.

Nontraditional Services

Emphasis on and funding for nontraditional services should increase. Preschool programs, integrated services to children and families, after-school and summer efforts, etc., are all permissible now and very worthwhile. We don't see more of such programs because they require support services and that means money—and the first priority for money is instructional activities. The states, in turn, tend to see instructional activities in terms of basic skills areas and often cannot see the connection between nontraditional services and the development of skills, basic or otherwise.

Preschool programs are invaluable. But without more money, districts will be forever balancing the need for a preventive approach against the fact that this takes money away from other grades and services. Finally, a greater emphasis on early intervention and support services should be accompanied by greater coordination with Head Start and other early childhood programs, all of which should have quality standards.

In short, there is an acute need for early intervention and child and family support services to complement and follow through on the academic program of Chapter 1, especially in districts and schools with high concentrations of poverty. That requires a great deal of additional money for Chapter 1 and a far more rational system of non-Chapter 1 child and family service delivery.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- ***More consideration should be given to maintaining Chapter 1 eligibility for schools that improve student performance yet remain low-income and for students whose achievement has improved.***

It makes no sense to reward improvement with the withdrawal of funds. And it makes no sense to assume that students who have improved are home free and need no more additional supports. While the maintenance of eligibility for a two-year period is covered somewhat under innovative programs, preliminary reports suggest that few districts take advantage of this provision because it is difficult to implement. The provision lacks flexibility. It calls for innovation yet rules out much beyond the traditional Chapter 1 approach.

- ***There also should be greater flexibility in who can participate in certain Chapter 1 activities, provided, of course, that all eligible children are being served.***

For example, "marginal" students cannot participate in programs, yet Chapter 1 may be just the boost they need. Nor is peer coaching between eligible and noneligible students or cross-grade matching supported. Flexibility of this sort could go a long way toward reducing stigmatization and labeling and encouraging creativity.

- Chapter 1 paraprofessionals should be working, as intended, with teachers, children, and parents; they should be included in staff development and meet standards.
- Standards for Chapter 1 students are too low; moreover, they are fixated on basic skills, an orientation that is reinforced by the heavy reliance on low-level, standardized, multiple-choice tests. We will devote considerable attention to this major issue.

JANET TINARI
Chapter 1 Chairperson, New York State Reading Association (NYSRA)
Albany, New York

In November 1991, I distributed a survey about Chapter 1 programs and their implementation in an effort to gather information on how teachers are carrying out major components of the Chapter 1 regulations, such as congruency and parent involvement. My recommendations, based on an analysis of the responses, follow.

CHAPTER 1 FUNDING

I would like to comment first on the need to allocate more funding in the area of early intervention and family education. I am now working in an early intervention program in which I try to help the young first grader feel successful in learning to read and write. I work in the classroom with the teacher to help those children who have difficulty acquiring early literacy skills. The program is also available to kindergarteners who show weaknesses in language skills. They have been successful.

I must stress the need to provide additional funding to expand on what districts can now do for parent education and involvement. Without parents' support and help at home, these at-risk first graders cannot succeed. It is even more important that funds be made available to reach families with preschool children to help them understand the important role they play in helping children come to school ready to learn. There is so much that the parent of the very young child can do to prepare him or her for school.

Helping the parents and adults in general to become literate so that their children value reading and writing is one of the most important goals that Chapter 1 programs should emphasize. Members of the New York State Reading Association, through their local councils, conduct many outreach projects that bring literacy information and training to those in homeless shelters and hospitals, to new mothers, and to needy people around the world.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Another area that I would like to discuss is the evaluation of the Chapter 1 programs. I feel that funding should be increased in the field of research and development. New ways to assess and evaluate progress made by students in our Chapter 1 program should be investigated.

Tests alone do not reflect the improvements children make, especially in the affective domain. It is important to help these students to feel better about themselves and to keep reading and writing, even when they are finding it difficult. Unless children are made to see literacy as valuable and enjoyable, they will choose not to read and write. Some form of performance portfolio, as well as the scores on standardized tests, should be used to evaluate programs.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

I would also like to see more funding going to the in-service staff development that is needed if classroom teachers and Chapter 1 teachers are to work together to provide an effective coordinated program that avoids fragmenting the student's day. It is an exciting time in education, when more teachers are working together, collaborating, coordinating, and teaming, and I feel that Chapter 1 has had a huge influence in encouraging these types of delivery models.

Reading teachers have been in the forefront of implementing new models of instruction and working with teachers in a cooperative effort to help those who are at risk. That is why Chapter 1 programs have been successful and will continue to be.

But there is a need to recognize the importance of the certified reading teacher, who wears many hats throughout the day as he or she coordinates schoolwide reading programs, evaluates students, trains teachers and parents, serves on the boards of their local reading councils, and continues to pursue knowledge in the field of language arts. Districts must be encouraged to use some of their Chapter 1 funds for the ongoing staff development of their Chapter 1 teachers.

Staff development must include an opportunity for those in the field to come together and exchange ideas and instructional techniques. The annual fall conference of the New York State Reading Association is indeed a forum for such a gathering. Funding to help send Chapter 1 staff to this conference, as well as to many educational workshops and seminars, should be made part of the Chapter 1 regulations.

Finally, I hope that the reauthorization of Chapter 1 regulations will increase the focus on family literacy education and the need to provide these at-risk students and their families with quality instruction by certified teachers of reading.

PAUL WECKSTEIN

Co-Director, Center for Law and Education
Washington, D.C.

I am speaking today on behalf of the Center for Law and Education, which represents the National Coalition of Title I/Chapter 1 Parents, so I am speaking on behalf of the consumers and beneficiaries of Chapter 1—the parents and their children.[2]

Let's stop and think about what we really want to accomplish, and what it will really take to make it happen. There is growing consensus on at least the broad outlines of what we want for poor children, indeed all children: mastery of a common core of skills and knowledge which cuts across all academic subjects, embraces what in the past has been called both basic and advanced skills, and reflects our democratic values and cultural diversity. There is growing agreement, at least within the realm of public debate, that we can no longer subject certain students to lower expectations.

Parents and students find it terribly frustrating and disheartening, however, when these shared beliefs are not translated into effective action and when provisions of federal law designed to achieve those results are not vigorously implemented. Therefore, after setting out some basic principles for the reauthorization of Chapter 1, I also want to note some directions for better fulfilling its promise under its existing structure.

BASIC ELEMENTS OF REAUTHORIZATION

- ***First, there must be a set of outcomes defined in terms of skills and knowledge that all children should know and be able to do, and determined through a democratic process with the real and informed involvement of teachers, parents, and students.***

A norm-referenced test score, or a normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain, is neither a skill nor knowledge.

- ***Second, there must be a school-based plan, including a curriculum, for all students to achieve those outcomes, again developed through the active participation of the teachers, parents, and students.***

These participants should not stop until they have arrived at a plan that they feel confident will actually achieve the results. The plan must focus on how the students can be helped to achieve those outcomes in the mainstream, regular program. Looking only at the 40 minutes of Chapter 1 instruction will not suffice.

- ***Third, there must be an ongoing, intensive staff development process for ensuring that the entire staff has the capacity, knowledge, and skills to achieve that result.***

---

[2] This commentary was originally presented as testimony on the reauthorization of elementary and secondary education programs before the U.S. Department of Education, April 3, 1992. The author is a member of the National Commission on Chapter 1 and of its steering committee.

The typical staff development activities in most schools are wholly inadequate to this task, both because they fail to tie the activities directly enough to that mission and because they do not provide for enough time throughout the year. Staff development must be intertwined with—indeed largely indistinguishable from—planning, curriculum development, and program assessment, if it is to be real.

- ***Fourth, the school must have accurate means for assessing whether the knowledge and skills have been mastered, with benchmarks of sufficient progress to result in mastery.***

NCE gains are inadequate: They don't tell you—in a way that is useful information for teachers, parents, and students to improve instruction and achievement—what particular skills have or have not been mastered; the extent to which they accurately reflect "more advanced" skills is limited at best; particularly for students who are farthest behind, the foremost focus of Chapter 1, they do not constitute sufficient progress to result in mastery.

At a rate of one, two, or even three NCE gains, students would have to be in school for much of their adult life to even approach the mastery of the skills we want for all children. Uniform state (or national) assessment instruments, even if criteria-referenced, will not by themselves achieve the desired ends. They must be supplemented with curriculum-based, frequent ongoing assessment that tells each teacher, parent, and student how well the student is doing and what skill areas need more attention.

- ***Fifth, there must be effective accountability mechanisms for remedying areas where the desired outcomes have not been achieved. These must be designed to assist not only whole schools that are not succeeding but also individual students who are having difficulty mastering particular outcomes.***

They must also be designed so as not to encourage creaming. And, if we are serious about seeking mastery for all students, then the system must be designed so that students who are farthest behind accelerate sufficiently to do so. Anything less, such as notions of "equal progress," would betray the basic commitment to having the same expectations of mastery for all.

- ***Sixth, schools must have adequate resources to achieve these results.***

This has implications for targeting and for comparability. While Chapter 1 resources can be used more effectively if, for example, they are focused on staff development to improve the regular program for Chapter 1 children, rather than on assuming all the instructional costs, it will still not be cheap. We must insist on programs of sufficient size, scope, and quality to achieve the desired outcomes. If we want to serve schools beyond those with the highest concentrations of low-income children, then we must add the money to do so, rather than spread it too thinly.

Further, to ensure that Chapter 1 funds are truly supplementary, we must move to a statewide notion of comparability. Where a state's funding system results in schools with higher concentrations of low-income students having fewer state and local resources per child, Chapter 1 funds are not supplementary, but are going instead toward services that non-Chapter 1 schools in the state provide out of other funds to non-Chapter 1 students. This must stop.

Similarly, we should move to school selection on the basis of poverty rates among the schools across the state. It makes no sense to have a school in a high-poverty district get no funds because it is below the mean for its district, when just across the line, in a wealthier district, another school with a much lower rate of poverty gets funding because its rate is nevertheless higher than its district average.

- ***Seventh, we must go beyond the rhetoric about parents as partners and make parent involvement in the entire program a reality.***

It isn't happening. The Department of Education and Congress should look at, and learn from, the two programs where involvement has been relatively real and successful: Head Start (at the group level) and the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (at the individual parent level). Both give parents a real role, not just "consultation," in significant decisions and ensure that they are fully informed in playing that role.

- ***Finally, and most important, we must unequivocally establish that all children covered by the program have the right to an education which effectively teaches the knowledge and skills we want all children to achieve.***

This right must encompass the elements itemized above—i.e., a right to a curriculum and resources which will prepare them to achieve the standards, to focus attention and program redesign when the program is not working, etc. (This right would not be violated by a failure to obtain the desired results per se, but rather by a failure to take the requisite steps to properly define those desired results, design and provide a program to achieve them, and respond when the outcomes are less than desired.)

Establishing this right—and ensuring that all teachers, administrators, students, and parents understand it—is critical for several reasons. If we are going to set goals for what all students should know and be able to do, it is both unconscionable and unconstitutional to hold students to that standard without providing them, as a basic right, with an effective education that teaches that knowledge and those skills.

We know also that, even with the greatest improvement in state and federal enforcement, government agencies cannot fully ensure compliance by themselves without the informed activity of the beneficiaries at the local level. Parents are the ultimate guardians of their children's interests, and they must have the tools to get their children's needs addressed.

This law has always been designed for disadvantaged students who inherently hold less power in their communities and are in need of protection. If we are to provide for school-based approaches and local flexibility, we must ensure that students and their parents are empowered to be real participants in that local setting and to obtain relief when the promise of the law is not fulfilled.

OBTAINING BETTER IMPLEMENTATION NOW

If many of the basic points I have made above sound familiar to you, that is because many of them are embodied, at least in limited form, in the current law (the congressional purpose of which is to help educationally deprived children succeed in the regular program, attain grade-level proficiency, and improve achievement in both basic and more advanced skills). While the act needs major revision to strengthen those provisions and to alter other provisions which cut against them, there is much that the department can and should do now to better implement the current law, without waiting for reauthorization.

- ***First, the department should remove what is perhaps the biggest obstacle to achievement of these goals—a regulatory definition of "desired outcomes" that is, frankly, contrary to the act.***

The act states that every local educational agency must state desired outcomes for the Chapter 1 program in terms of the "basic and more advanced skills which all children are expected to master." In the regulations, the definition of desired outcomes states that they must, at a minimum, be expressed in terms of some aggregate improvement beyond zero, in norm-referenced terms.[3] This regulation was published without the benefit of any public comment; the proposed regulation lacked a definition of "desired outcomes."

As a result, states and localities have largely opted—indeed felt obligated—to express desired outcomes in terms of 1, 2, or occasionally 3 NCE gains on norm-referenced tests. NCE gains do not, however, represent the basic and advanced skills that all children are expected to master. They do not represent skills at all. Further, they will never result in mastery of those skills, since at a rate of 1 NCE gain per year, the students most in need will be on a hundred-year march to reach that level.

The current school reform movement is based on the recognition that even students performing at the median grade level are not now mastering the advanced skills we expect all students to master.

Moreover, in states that have redefined the skills expected of all students, in criterion-referenced terms at a particular grade, the Chapter 1 program has nevertheless not adopted those skills as the desired outcomes.

The department should simply delete this definition. It should instead provide guidance to states and localities on how to set desired outcomes in terms of the basic and more advanced skills that all children are expected to master, as well as how to set "substantial progress" in terms that will actually result in such mastery.

- ***Second, the department should make sure that localities and states get serious about the current requirement for identifying and addressing the needs of those students who are individually failing to make substantial annual progress toward the desired outcomes.***

---

[3] 34 U.S.C. SS200.6(c) and 200.38(b)(1)(ii).

There is widespread noncompliance with this basic requirement. Millions of students are thereby falling through the cracks without any effective effort to figure out why and to remedy it.

- ***Third, the department should remove the current set of incentives under which, contrary to the law, requirements for supplementing, rather than supplanting, regular services are seen as a reason for segregated programming.***

In particular, it should be made clear that pullout programs are supplanting when either the students miss a portion of the curriculum available to other students (for example, when students are pulled out of science, social studies, or art for reading remediation), or when Chapter 1 funds are used to pay the entire cost of a pullout teacher, rather than only the additional per pupil cost in excess of that paid for the regular classroom teacher.[4] From this perspective, supplement, not supplant, can and should be an important incentive for mainstreaming and truly supplemental, nonpullout services.

- ***Fourth, the Department should get much more serious about enforcement of the existing parent-involvement requirements.***

To get a sense of the massive degree of noncompliance, one need do no more than go into the vast majority of districts and ask parents whether they were even informed about the requirements for the district to set desired outcomes. Were they consulted in the development of desired outcomes, as the act requires? How many were told that their children were not making substantial progress toward the desired outcomes and consulted on how to revise the student's program to do so?

The current act also requires annual evaluation of parent involvement. It does not allow school administrators to simply blame the parents and say that nothing can be done. Rather, it requires the district to consult with parents to determine why and what action needs to be taken. By and large, this isn't happening.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

I urge the U.S. Department of Education to get a jump on reauthorization by taking a results-oriented approach to the current law. At this stage, when a district's application is approved simply because it has some words on the page about desired outcomes, even though those desired outcomes are not stated in the terms set forth in the act, or when a district's approach to parent involvement is approved because the district has a policy, even though that policy doesn't actually address the required elements in any meaningful fashion, we are not even at paper compliance. We are certainly not addressing the need to move beyond what is actually happening. If the department were to seek to rectify these implementation problems under the current law, we would all learn a great deal about how to shape the reauthorization.

---

[4] In other words, assume that the instructional costs associated with a regular reading class of 20 students are $15,000—or $750 per child. This is the amount of state and local funds which would normally be spent on a child, Chapter 1 or otherwise, for reading. Assume Chapter 1 students are pulled into a Chapter 1 reading class of 15 where the cost is also $15,000—or $1,000 per child—instead of the regular class. Currently, schools often pay the full costs with Chapter 1 funds. In fact, this should be seen as a violation of supplement, not supplant—they are supplanting the $750 per child that would normally be spent on reading instruction for these children. Instead, they should be required to determine the excess, spend and then use the Chapter 1 funds to pay only for that excess—in this case, pay $11,250 ($750 x 15) out-of-state and local funds and only $3,750 ($250 x 15) out of Chapter 1 funds. This would quickly eliminate the incentive for pullouts and would encourage other, more supplemental, forms of services.

Finally, we recognize that successful implementation and enforcement requires resources. If the department is interested in moving implementation in this direction, you can count on those of us who represent students to actively support appropriation of the funds you need to do so. It could be quite useful for Congress to hear that program beneficiaries, not just bureaucrats, do not want all the dollars to be put into services at the expense of oversight and guidance.

GENE WILHOIT
Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)
Alexandria, Virginia

NEW CHALLENGES FOR CHAPTER 1

We began our review of the reauthorization of Chapter 1 with an awareness of a changing societal and policy context that will shape this reauthorization. Nearly 30 years after Lyndon Johnson unveiled his Great Society programs, and more than 10 years after Ronald Reagan launched his laissez-faire revolution, poverty and income inequality persist. As Congress proceeds to reauthorize Chapter 1 and the other elementary and secondary education programs, it will have to give thought to the magnitude of problems caused by intense, intergenerational poverty and changes in the structure of America's families.

The carnage in the Los Angeles riot indicates that persistent poverty and the array of circumstances that follow in its wake—high unemployment, cynicism, welfare dependency, and drug-related crime—must be addressed; otherwise, an entire generation of children will be condemned to a permanent state of underprivilege and despair. Federal policymakers must attempt to rectify these conditions.

Second, Congress must be willing to implement fiscal policies that will provide the flow of funding needed to alleviate the problems described above. Battered by an antiestablishment sentiment and the nation's troubling economic climate, Congress has entered a dark period of spending reform that could have a devastating effect on new authorizing legislation. Critical budgetary issues were at the forefront of policy debates in 1992. In spring, Congress failed to pass legislation to remove the barriers, imposed by the Budget Enforcement Act, that prevent the transfer of funds between defense and domestic programs. Yet, savings in defense spending resulting from the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union offer the prospect of dramatic, fundamental changes in fiscal policies that could enhance the quality of life for Americans.

Also in 1992, Congress voted down legislation calling for a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget. The new Congress will have to decide, within the context of this reauthorization, federal government priorities in domestic policy, including education. For if educational programs are to be dramatically expanded, Congress will have to appropriate the funds to provide the services.

Third, Congress will need to define the appropriate federal role in education. Historically, the federal role in elementary and secondary education is a supportive one. States and localities take primary responsibility for education, with the federal government providing support through categorical programs for students who need additional assistance in order to succeed. Increasingly, we are seeing new directions in federal education policy. Over the last two years, federal policymakers have focused on national education goals, national standards, and a national system of assessment for education. With Congress indicating dissatisfaction with the quality of the nation's education system, the question becomes what will be the appropriate federal role for improving education.

The year 1993 will be a critical juncture. Congress can continue to seek a broadened role in education policymaking or it can tinker with the reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) programs. Congress can shape new economic investment priorities, or decide that both timing and budgetary stringencies militate against such action. All of these issues will set the tone for the reauthorization.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CHAPTER 1

Despite Chapter 1's many years of operation, policymakers are just beginning to uncover the most successful models to teach disadvantaged children more effectively. In the 1990s, the hoped-for direction for Chapter 1 will be to shape the program so that it can stimulate systemic reform in entire schools serving at-risk children.

One of the fundamental issues that the education committees will examine will be the effectiveness of the Chapter 1 program. Chapter 1 is considered a success. Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, told the Senate in June 1991:

> Chapter 1 has been a proven success, even though it has never come close to being fully funded. Over the past 20 years it has been around, we've seen a dramatic rise in the school achievement levels of poor and minority students. We've also seen the gap separating their achievement and that of other children narrow substantially.

Most policymakers in Washington agree with Mr. Shanker that Chapter 1 represents successful federal intervention in education. Public support for this legislation extends well beyond political circles to educational researchers and policy analysts. Yet, the data on compensatory education programs over the past 20 years tell a less-compelling story. These data show that compensatory education programs have a modest, positive effect on school achievement, observable principally in the early grades and strongest in mathematics. Its effect does not endure once program services are ended.

In addition, the data show that Chapter 1 programs are most effective with marginal students who make rapid improvements and then are promoted out of the program. Chapter 1 services are least effective with weak students who continue in the program year after year.

Chapter 1 has evolved over the years. During the 1970s and 1980s, Title I/Chapter 1 operated essentially as a financial aid program based on two key statutory provisions: (1) comparability of services and (2) supplement, not supplant. Together, these two provisions were designed to ensure that Chapter 1 students received more funds—and hence more services—than non-Chapter 1 students. The underlying principle was that if you could ensure that Chapter 1 schools received their fair share of state and local resources (comparability), and that the program supplemented normal services, the performance of Chapter 1 students should improve. To a certain extent, this premise is still used today.

As part of the reauthorization process, policymakers will have to clarify whether Chapter 1 is intended primarily as a poverty program or an educational program. Currently, it is administered as a poverty-based program at the school level and as an educational program at the student level.

To a degree, the 1988 reauthorization of Chapter 1 shifted the emphasis of the program back to an educational focus. Lawmakers and advocates focused their attention on the quality of the supplemental services and specified what they expected students to achieve. In 1988, the policy was set that academic standards for Chapter 1 students should not differ substantially from those expected for other students of the same age or grade level. However, this goal has been only partially successful.

But at the same time, the underlying principle of Chapter 1 that compensatory program funds must be spent on the lowest-achieving students in the qualifying schools leads to the practice of ensuring that these funds are spent only on Chapter 1 students. Trying to meet the substantial monitoring requirements and compliance reporting requirements associated with the program has inhibited the development of cooperative and collaborative programs at the local level. In the extreme, this emphasis leads to the practice of designing programs that facilitate monitoring rather than maximizing student learning.

THE SEARCH FOR CREATIVE APPROACHES

One solution that we strongly endorse was suggested by the Maryland Department of Education in testimony submitted to the U.S. Department of Education.

> Reducing rigid policies and regulation to promote integrated and collaborative teaching approaches would enable states to create a more inclusive educational system responsive to all students. In moving forward with this objective, it is important to preserve procedural safeguards for children served by Chapter 1 and other categorical programs. But, steps must be taken to remove the procedural and regulatory barriers that limit schools from developing inclusive and integrated approaches to learning for all students.

The Maryland Department of Education suggests, for example, that Chapter 1-funded staff could work with all students in a specified grade or subject area that has been identified as an area of greatest need in a school. Currently, Chapter 1 staff can work only with identified students.

Another possibility to stimulate experimentation is to permit local districts to use up to 5 percent of their Chapter 1 allocation to promote integrated teaching practices. This category should be included in the list of innovation project activities authorized by current law.

The Maryland Department of Education also suggests that Chapter 1 programs should be articulated with all local and federal programs that affect services to disadvantaged children. For example, the Dwight D. Eisenhower program can provide valuable staff development in mathematics for Chapter 1 teachers. The Chapter 2 program creates potential for the coordinated use of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 dollars to support program improvement efforts. The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act (S. 2 and H.R. 4323), if enacted, could provide additional resources alongside Chapter 1 for school improvement initiatives. Such collaborative and integrated efforts must be articulated in the Chapter 1 statute.

The issue of staff development and teaching practice is an important one for this reauthorization. Such deficiencies as lack of coordination between the Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers and absence of challenging curriculum may be attributable to inferior teaching skill. This is a critical issue because, to a large extent, the success of Chapter 1 students depends on the motivation and skills of individual teachers.

Stultifying educational methods influence children's attitudes about learning. If early learning is reduced to mastery of work sheets and phonic exercises, children fail to understand the power of reading to inform and to entertain. If writing is limited to tracing letters and learning punctuation rules, students miss its potential for expression and communication. These attitudes are tremendous barriers to efforts to turn students into independent learners, creative thinkers, and cooperative workers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The difficulty lies in how to encourage these types of creative approaches to teaching within the context of the Chapter 1 legislation. Moreover, one may question the wisdom of discouraging or changing teaching methodology using federal legislation. We recommend the following:

- ***Set aside a substantial portion of Chapter 1 funds in the reauthorized program for staff development and the adoption of programs known to be effective.***

Under current regulations, schools can use a small portion of their funds for staff development, but these funds are rarely applied to the kind of training, follow-up, and assessment needed for effective implementation of validated programs. One-day workshops with no follow-up are more typical. The type of staff development we recommend would be in-depth, ongoing, extensive in-service training with in-class follow-up.

- ***Authorize funds for state facilitators and state departments of education to provide training services to schools to assist them in adopting effective instructional models.***

These programs should enable teachers, parents, and administrators to participate in choosing the programs to implement in their schools. Another key element would be to involve all teachers—not just Chapter 1 teachers—so that they can learn together the best ways to teach disadvantaged children.

In conclusion, we believe that there is a great opportunity for Chapter 1 to build on some of the education reforms of the past few years. Most important, Congress should seize this opportunity to take a new look at categorical education programs for children. Individualizing the curriculum for students with special learning needs does not have to mean providing intensive tutoring with the goal of "catching up," nor does this indicate a need for separate classes for such students. NASBE, and others in the field, believe that solutions are not calculated from label-specific formulas.

Solutions must include individualized learning goals, the support of teachers and other students, and the use of teaching strategies devised by teams of regular and special educators, looking at individual students and pooling their resources and professional talents. Solutions are not found in the exclusionary programs or in the categorization by label, room, or curriculum. Instead, solutions to the problems of educating students with special needs can be found in the inclusion of all students and in providing the necessary support for them and their teacher to succeed.

ARLENE ZIELKE
Vice President for Legislative Activity
National PTA
Washington, D.C.

The National PTA (National Congress of Parents and Teachers) believes that the authorization of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, P.L. 100-297, presents an excellent opportunity to reexamine the federal role in elementary and secondary education. This process should also be used to assess how well the federal government is addressing the needs of disadvantaged youngsters and providing equal access to quality educational opportunities for all children.

The National PTA has the following three overriding goals for this reauthorization:

- The federal government must strengthen its role of supplementing state and local efforts to educate disadvantaged children and those with special needs, to ensure that they are able to achieve the same outcome standards other children are expected to meet.
- Congress and the new administration must focus special energy over the next four years to achieve the *first* national educational goal: By the year 2000, all children will start school ready to learn. Obviously we must continue to improve and expand the education and related programs designed to serve the disadvantaged children already in the pipeline, but we must assure that young poor children are ready to learn when they begin school in the years ahead. We must also guarantee that schools reorganize so they can readily provide effective services for children.
- The programs authorized in Hawkins-Stafford must focus on prevention rather than remediation.

The concentration of poverty in a community correlates strongly with students' educational success. Poverty is increasing in this country, with one in four children under the age of six now considered poor. In addition, health-care costs are increasing at record rates, restricting low-income families' access to needed services, a situation that can directly and lastingly affect whether children learn to their full potential. Further, state and local governments are facing unprecedented fiscal crises that limit their ability to adequately meet the growing social service needs of poor families.

This well-documented connection between poverty and achievement must be recognized as a fundamental fact driving reauthorization. If Congress seriously seeks to improve American education for disadvantaged children, this renewal legislation must be more comprehensive, require the collaboration of existing child-serving agencies, and ensure increased federal resources. Supplemental services, such as Chapter 1 and bilingual education, must be organized as part of the regular instructional program, and more effective links must be established between the home and the school.

The National PTA believes that a comprehensive package for educational improvement and reform must incorporate the following basic facts and principles:

- All children can learn, but to do so they must have adequate opportunities for success in school, including access to whatever supplemental services they may need to meet the educational standards that all children are expected to meet.
- Federal funding or services must continue to supplement not supplant local and state efforts.
- The current American educational research system, consisting of a national network of laboratories and centers, must be utilized to its fullest extent. Wherever possible, the various components of this bill should be based on the results of identified research. PTA members are particularly interested that information about successful models for parent involvement and other home/school partnerships be widely disseminated.
- Schools and other community agencies must collaborate in providing access to health, nutrition, and other social services children need to succeed in school.
- Local school districts, with state assistance, must develop content and performance standards that all children must master, and levels of learning for children with special needs must be raised to the levels expected of all children. In addition, school delivery standards must be developed to ensure that all children have adequate opportunity to achieve these standards.
- Allowance must be made to assure maximum local, school-based, decisionmaking, including parents, educators, and the entire school community.
- All children are entitled to attend schools where they are physically safe. This means that students must be safe from guns and all forms of violence and abuse, including corporal punishment, and they must be protected from environmental hazards in schools, such as asbestos, radon, pesticides, and lead.
- Teachers and administrators must receive adequate preservice and in-service training, including in parent involvement.
- School-reform efforts must center around innovations and improvements that aim to serve the needs of children and families more effectively.
- Pullout programs that are not coordinated with the general instructional program should give way to increased instructional coordination between the general program and Chapter 1.
- Language-minority students must have full educational opportunities, and barriers that currently inhibit full participation of limited-English-proficient students must be eliminated.
- A high level of bilingualism, among both language-minority and language-majority children, should be encouraged to promote cognitive and social growth and international competitiveness.

- Services provided to children with multiple characteristics placing them at risk—such as poverty, limited English proficiency, homelessness, drug and alcohol problems, illiterate parents, etc.—should not always be administered separately and discretely. We must retain the categorical distinctions in current law (rather than creating a block grant); however, commingling of funds should be considered to ensure that schools address the identified needs most effectively.

In short, the various programs of Hawkins-Stafford must be integrated to meet children's and families' needs as reflected through local school programs. Ideally, local schools will devise standards for their students—incorporating parent and community input—and will use supplemental federal assistance to ensure that all children meet those standards through state and federal monitoring systems. Working in partnership with states and local school districts to meet children's special needs across the country is *the* purpose of the federal government in education.

All levels of government share responsibility for educating America's children. The National PTA believes, however, that the federal government's responsibility—while proportionally small—is of critical importance, particularly in meeting the needs of disadvantaged children and families. In brief, the federal government should:

- Uphold and enforce basic civil rights protections
- Invest in research and development to improve the quality of education
- Assist in ensuring access and equal opportunity to education through such programs as Chapter 1, education for children with disabilities and other special needs, and postsecondary grants and loans for students with limited financial resources
- Prepare the work force to meet the nation's economic and defense needs.

The federal role, especially in terms of targeted programs and funding, is critical to children living in poverty and to school districts suffering from funding inequalities. These children may need more, or different, services than other children to achieve educational success. In formulating new legislation, the federal government must incorporate the general guiding principles listed above and consider this special responsibility to children and families living in poverty.

To accommodate these principles, we recommend that the new Hawkins-Stafford legislation be organized under the following titles:

- Parent and family involvement
- School reform for sound practice
- Development based on research
- Professional development
- School and student progress
- Technology

- Program improvement
- Collaboration and consortia
- Funding and equity
- New programs.

A strong parent-involvement policy that can be achieved using home visits or school-site programs might include the following key goals:

- Help parents develop skills they need to improve their parenting abilities and prepare their children to learn
- Provide parents with information about what children are learning in school and how parents can continue that learning at home
- Create two-way home-school communication about school programs and children's progress
- Ensure that community services and other support programs designed for children and families with special needs are coordinated with the educational program
- Offer opportunities for parents to volunteer in the classroom
- Include parents in decisionmaking and leadership roles in school governance activities
- Prepare parents for advocacy on behalf of their children
- Encourage partnerships with businesses to allow working parents up to eight hours off per year to volunteer in their children's schools
- Encourage parents of all children in a school or community to identify common goals and work together to achieve them.

To support schools that are in the midst of reform, and to encourage schools that have not begun to reform, the National PTA makes the following recommendations:

- Use up to 20 percent of each school district's Chapter 1 allocation to develop more student- and teacher-centered schools through the "program improvement" process. The money could be used to change the organization, as well as the curriculum, of a school, focusing on:
    - — providing more comprehensive education and related services
    - — increasing parental involvement
    - — developing appropriate school and student progress measures
    - — conducting research
    - — offering clinically developed professional development opportunities related to the Chapter 1 goals

—collaborating or building consortia with other organizations

—utilizing current technologies in schools.

- Redesign Chapter 2, renaming it the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, as outlined in H.R. 4323. We recommend reducing the state share of Chapter 2 to 5 percent from the current 20 percent and increasing the appropriation to $1 billion.
- Require parent involvement in all school-reform decisions.

To close the gap between research and development, we recommend:

- Increased research and development on new and appropriate education-related technologies, especially new software programs
- Giving all public schools equal access to new education technologies and software
- Computer networking of the staff, parents of children receiving Chapter 1 services, school and school district administrators, research laboratories and centers, higher education institutions, state Chapter 1 offices, etc.

Professional development should be based on goals and driven by performance, rather than by credentials. The National PTA recommends:

- Focusing preservice programs on the needs of diverse and multicultural student populations
- Preservice preparation for teachers in meeting the educational and related needs of economically disadvantaged children, similar to programs for special education teachers
- Preservice preparation for teachers in the various aspects of parental and community involvement and in governance activities, such as school-based management, curriculum decisionmaking, and group decisionmaking with teams of teachers
- Preservice and continuing education opportunities to enable teachers to use research in pedagogy, child development, effective skills, and subject disciplines.

The states, local school districts, and individual schools are ultimately accountable for the appropriate use of Hawkins-Stafford funds. The primary means for measuring if this responsibility is met has been the use of standardized tests. We believe the current Chapter 1 testing practices, some of which have been in place for over 25 years, are unproductive and inconsistent as accurate measures of higher-level thinking skills required of Chapter 1 students.

Current law encourages the use of other assessment tools besides standardized testing, yet few states have collected more varied data, especially regarding developmental indexes, teaching practices, and parental involvement. The federal government's role in assessment is to assist state and local education agencies by researching better assessment models, collecting these data, and reporting information based on a set of indicators. We recommend that:

- The National Academy of Sciences or the National Academy of Education oversee the development of appropriate assessments measuring Chapter 1 progress of both the school and the students
- Multiple assessments be used to determine the effectiveness of Chapter 1 programs and student achievement
- Local school districts decide about their own assessment systems based on educational standards required of all students in their local school district with assistance and guidance from the state education agency.

Schools must dramatically increase the use of technology to reform and improve education, and the federal government must play the lead role in instituting this change. We recommend that the federal government develop technology policies and infrastructure for education through which public schools would receive special services and funding for technology-related equipment and materials that serve to improve, enhance, and strengthen the instructional program. The federal government might also encourage public/private partnerships for working with schools to set up or expand their use of technology.

The program improvement mechanisms in current law failed because of an unworkable and ineffective assessment system of standardized tests and NCE gains on which program improvement is based. We need a better system for identifying improvement. We recommend that as a condition for receiving Chapter 1 funds, every eligible school and school district must develop and implement a school improvement plan. We further recommend:

- Increased technical assistance to local education agencies to improve their programs
- The increased use of schoolwide projects, with the eligibility threshold of children in poverty lowered from 75 percent to 50 percent.

Collaboration differs from coordination. In coordination, people agree to discuss plans, but they do not actually join together to solve problems. Collaboration requires a formal commitment with action and strategies to actually implement changes.

A defining component of Head Start's success is its clearly stated goal to provide collaborative services to poor preschool children. We believe that by replicating the successful aspects of the Head Start program, and by requiring better collaboration between Head Start, elementary education programs, and other young-child related programs, we can improve the services now provided to disadvantaged children. To do this, we recommend the following:

- We must reward successful collaborative models and abandon the disincentives associated with Chapter 1's school improvement provisions.
- Schools must provide comprehensive services efficiently and effectively by encouraging the use of schools as centers for child-serving services.
- Community-based service organizations must collaborate with school districts and designate a coordinator of children's services who will assist families in navigating the programs designed to help children with their specific needs.

Despite the fact that the Chapter 1 program is the largest federal elementary and secondary education program, it is sorely underfunded. Since 1980, the appropriation for this program, when adjusted for inflation, has only increased 9 percent. Currently, only about 54 percent of eligible children are served. We recommend that:

- Federal, state, and local agencies that administer health, nutrition, and other social service programs related to educational achievement be required to share with schools the costs of providing these services.
- The current funding level for Chapter 1—$6.7 billion—be used to provide the comprehensive services that we have described to children from age three through the third grade. An additional $6 billion must be appropriated to provide these services for children in grades 4 through 9, and approximately $3 billion would be needed for students in grades 10 to 12.
- If full funding cannot be guaranteed, the bulk of the appropriations for Chapter 1 be concentrated at the preschool through third grade levels.
- School districts be allowed flexibility in using federal funds to meet the stated goals of individual programs.
- Funding for bilingual education programs and federally impacted schools be significantly increased.

The thrust of many of our recommendations so far has been aimed at meeting the first of the six national education goals: "All children will start school ready to learn." However, assuring that all children are ready to learn goes beyond providing quality early childhood development services, or even preschool health screenings and medical services. Children whose health and/or safety is threatened for whatever reason are not ready to learn.

Therefore, we recommend the authorization of the following new programs:

- A ban on corporal punishment in all elementary and secondary schools receiving federal funds
- The creation of school-based or school-linked health clinics and social service centers, using legislation from the 102nd Congress, the Comprehensive Services for Youth bill, as a model
- A school environmental safety program requiring inspection for environmental hazards such as radon, lead, and pesticides; notification of parents and others in

the school community if hazards are found; and the development of a plan for eliminating hazards

- A grant program to local education agencies for innovative education and training programs to make their schools secure from violence.

Chapter Four

STATE ADMINISTRATORS

LOIS ADAMS-RODGERS
Deputy Commissioner, Learning Support Services
Kentucky Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky

The following commentary discusses the strengths of the current Chapter 1 program and some areas that we feel need reforming if Chapter 1 is going to become a truly integral part of a comprehensive system for educating our children.

STRENGTHS OF THE CURRENT CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

Funding Formula

The current formula should continue to be used in allocating funds to local school districts based on counts of low-income children and state per pupil expenditures. This formula allows the funds to reach those school districts which have the greatest number of students needing Chapter 1 service. Additional funds for districts with heavy concentration of low-income children should also continue. These additional funds have been a tremendous help in reaching more children who are in the greatest need of service.

Needs Assessment and Selection of Students

The annual assessment of educational need in each school district should continue. Services need to be provided in those greatest need areas as identified by the needs assessment. Those students in greatest need as identified by the needs assessment should continue to be served first.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement in Chapter 1 programs is a must. The current regulations should continue to exclude mandatory parent advisory councils. The present concept of training the parents to work with their children in the home and training the teachers and principals to work effectively with the parents of Chapter 1 students is much more effective.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE CURRENT CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

Service Delivery to Students

Flexibility of service delivery is a specific topic of concern. The 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act calls for major changes in the instruction of all students. To emphasize students' use of knowledge, instruction now stresses cooperative learning, the integration of reading, writing, and math with other content areas, and the grouping of students heterogeneously. As Chapter 1 services are provided in the regular classrooms, it is difficult to avoid the occasional, incidental participation of ineligible students.

A fear of supplanting often results in separate Chapter 1 instruction. This separation causes the labeling of children and children missing classroom instruction. Allowing the incidental participation of ineligible students with Chapter 1 participants during such activities as cooperative learning and peer tutoring would help alleviate this separation. Chapter 1 staff could then model thinking strategies and encourage multiple approaches to problem solving while providing support as needed to Chapter 1 participants in multiability groups with non-Chapter 1 students.

Schoolwide Projects

Another topic of concern deals with schoolwide projects. Schoolwide projects may facilitate schoolwide improvement by allowing for the maximum utilization of staff and effective, integrated service to students. Lowering the eligibility from 75 percent to 50 percent low income would greatly increase the number of schools that qualify for a schoolwide project. A balance between not labeling educationally deprived students for service while ensuring that more students continue to make gains must be maintained. Also, current levels of Chapter 1 funding may not be sufficient to support changes needed for schoolwide improvement.

Evaluation of Chapter 1 Programs

On June 8, 1989, the Kentucky Supreme Court directed the General Assembly to create and establish a new and "efficient system of common schools." The court established a new legal framework for the school curriculum by setting forth seven capacities as necessary for an adequate education. These were incorporated in the Kentucky Education Reform Act, as follows:

- Skills in oral and written communication
- Knowledge of the economic, political, and social system
- Understanding of government processes
- Self-knowledge of mental and physical wellness
- A grounding in the arts
- Preparation for advanced training

- Competitive academic and vocational skills.

The Council on School Performance Standards was created and charged with determining what all students should know and be able to do and how learning should be assessed. The following six learning goals for all students were recommended, with particular emphasis on what students should be able to do:

- Apply basic communication and mathematic skills in situations similar to what they will experience in life
- Apply core concepts and principles from mathematics, science, social studies, arts and humanities, practical living studies, and vocational studies to situations similar to what they will experience in life
- Demonstrate self-sufficiency
- Demonstrate responsible group membership
- Think and solve problems
- Integrate knowledge across disciplines.

In addition, the council recommended that the state launch a major effort to assess students' performance beyond what can be measured by paper-and-pencil tests. Seventy-five learning outcomes were developed to assess the learning goals. Learning outcomes require students to demonstrate that they can use skills and knowledge in situations that they might experience in real-life or advanced training after high school.

Kentucky has established clear, statewide standards to achieve national goals and now relies on "authentic" assessment to measure learning advances, equity, and excellence for students. Result-oriented, authentic assessments raise expectations for learning, measure the meaningful, and focus on what all students can do with their knowledge.

Authentic assessments measure progress toward statewide goals. Fourth, eighth, and twelfth graders are tested in three dimensions: short answer/essay, individual and group-performance events, and collections of student work in writing and mathematics portfolios. Student and school scores are reported on an absolute scale rising from novice to apprentice to proficient to distinguished. The first round of assessments showed that 90 percent of Kentucky's students ranked novice and apprentice.

The federal programs, so essential to Kentucky to educational equity and excellence, unfortunately, have discouraged the use of authentic assessment. Chapter 1, the largest program, drives accountability for all federal programs and, in too many instances, state and local programs as well. Its requirement that schools use standardized, norm-referenced tests increases dependency on formats that fail to measure performance over time and to align with local curricula. The current system impedes the drive toward higher performance.

LINDA BROWN
Supervisor, Compensatory Education Programs
State Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan

CHAPTER 1 GOALS AND SERVICES

The Hawkins-Stafford amendments of 1988 provided new and clearer goals for Chapter 1 and led to major changes in Chapter 1 services and their relationship to the regular school program. Each district must now design its Chapter 1 program to help its lowest-achieving children succeed in the regular program and attain basic skills, as well as more advanced skills, such as reasoning, problem solving, and decisionmaking.[1]

Chapter 1 and regular school staff must work together to achieve these outcomes and must jointly develop improvement plans in schools where Chapter 1 students are not making progress. Districts must also seek to increase the involvement of parents in their children's education and assist parents in taking steps to help their children at home.

Michigan's school districts have responded very positively to the Hawkins-Stafford amendments and are to be commended for their efforts to ensure that their programs reflect the new goals. However, several issues have emerged as impediments to the acceptance and successful implementation of the new congressional mandates for Chapter 1. These issues are discussed below.

MEASURING STUDENT PROGRESS

Chapter 1 depends heavily on the use of norm-referenced achievement tests to measure student progress. Aggregate gains on norm-referenced tests are used to identify schools below the state standard. These schools are then required to develop and implement school program improvement plans.

Many school district staff believe that the current norm-referenced achievement tests are not valid measures of the progress of Chapter 1 students, particularly in the areas of reasoning and problem solving, which are being emphasized in response to the new law. The general criticisms of standardized tests, which include cultural bias and nonalignment with the curriculum, continue to be directed to Chapter 1 program evaluation.

The Hawkins-Stafford amendments do permit districts to establish desired outcomes other than norm-referenced test gains. However, the attainment of these outcomes is treated as an additional measure, not as a substitute for norm-referenced test gains, in evaluating student progress and identifying schools in need of program improvement.

---

[1] This report on Chapter 1 program issues was prepared for the Michigan State Board of Education in October 1991. Based on issues identified by local Chapter 1 practitioners and Michigan Department of Education staff, the report reflects the strong support that exists for the current Chapter 1 program, as well as problem areas and recommended solutions.

Norm-referenced test results are an important measure of student progress, and the only measure that can be easily aggregated to provide a national picture of Chapter 1 student gains. As such, they should continue to be collected, at least on a sample basis. However, it is recommended that for the purpose of program improvement, Congress be asked to consider giving state and local school districts more discretion in determining the best measures of student progress.

IDENTIFYING LOW-SUCCESS SCHOOLS

The Chapter 1 law requires that schools be identified for improvement after a single year of low results. Although this is based on the desirable goal of initiating improvements quickly, a single year's results often do not reflect a school's long-term success. The problem of correct identification has been further compounded by a U.S. Department of Education decision that only spring-to-spring or fall-to-fall results can be used. For schools with high mobility, fall-to-spring results based on a larger number of students are a more accurate measure of the school's success.

Increased flexibility for state and local school districts in identifying schools for program improvement would permit more careful and accurate identification, including the examination of results for more than one year. It is recommended that Congress be asked to consider giving states the opportunity to address this issue in their state program improvement plans, without being required to conform to uniform procedures established by the U.S. Department of Education.

EVALUATING LONG-TERM OUTCOMES

The new goals for Chapter 1 make it clear that the purpose of the program is to help prepare educationally deprived children for productive and responsible adult lives. Chapter 1 funding has been increased substantially in response to the nation's changing demographics and concerns about its future productivity and well-being.

To help ensure that Chapter 1 serves its intended purpose, Congress has established multiple evaluation requirements. Districts must conduct an annual review of program effectiveness for each Chapter 1 school, based on aggregate gains on norm-referenced tests and progress toward achieving the district's desired outcomes. Once every three years, districts must complete a sustained-effects study that measures the progress of the same students over a period of at least two years. Once every three years, districts must also conduct a review of the progress of Chapter 1 students in the regular program, based on appropriate indicators of success. However, in spite of these varied requirements, districts generally do not have adequate information to determine the long-term outcomes for their Chapter 1 students, in terms of successful school completion and readiness for adult life.

Districts are likely to object, with good reason, to the establishment of an additional evaluation requirement, such as a longitudinal study through high school completion. Instead, it is recommended that Congress be asked to consider replacing the current multiple evaluation requirements with a single requirement.

Such a requirement would have districts design and conduct comprehensive evaluations of their Chapter 1 programs, with a focus on both short-term and long-term student outcomes. This would allow districts to establish a clearer emphasis for their Chapter 1 evaluation efforts and streamline their various current activities under one comprehensive evaluation design.

INCORPORATING RESEARCH-BASED PRACTICES

As districts obtain information about effective instructional practices for low-achieving children, they would like to be able to use Chapter 1 resources in new ways. Districts are sometimes prevented from doing this by legal provisions that are intended to protect eligible children, not to prevent districts from serving them more effectively. For example, cooperative learning, a proven strategy for increasing the learning of low-achieving students, depends on grouping that also includes high and average achievers. Yet Chapter 1 staff are prevented by law from working with groups that include non-Chapter 1 students.

An agreement to seek greater flexibility in the use of federal resources in exchange for accountability for results was made at the 1989 President's Education Summit with Governors. Federal legislation is being considered to permit districts to apply for waivers of specific federal requirements in order to try new practices. Continuation of the waiver would depend on the success of the district in meeting program goals. If a waiver provision is not enacted before the reauthorization of Chapter 1 in 1993, it is recommended that Congress be asked to consider such a provision as part of the reauthorization.

As stated in the introduction to these issues, the new provisions of Chapter 1 enacted in the Hawkins-Stafford amendments are generally viewed as very positive. Michigan's school districts are already experiencing the beneficial effects of the changes, as demonstrated by a new enthusiasm on the part of Chapter 1 staffs and students, widespread favorable comments by regular classroom teachers, and improvement in achievement test results. Resolution of the identified issues would serve to further increase support for the Chapter 1 goals and strengthen district commitment to ensuring success for Chapter 1 students.

DONALD L. CARTER

State Consultant, Chapter 1
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

There are so many concerns in Chapter 1 that I found it difficult to select just one or two topics. But, I selected the one that I felt could most influence the outcome of Chapter 1 and could realistically be implemented.

It became obvious several years ago that we know the ingredients that make up an effective Chapter 1 program. We may call these ingredients *correlates* or the ten attributes of an effective Chapter 1 program. The question is, If we know these characteristics, then why aren't we implementing them? The answer is, We are, but very slowly. Effective programs (e.g., HOTS, Comer Model, Success for All, etc.) are working their way into Chapter 1, but at a snail's pace. This brings me to the topic of training.

I see as one of the primary drawbacks to effective programs in Chapter 1 the lack of proper training of teachers. Many teachers asked to develop effective reading programs lack the proper skills or training to accomplish this task. Many of the colleges still train teachers to address reading as a remedial program. In fact, many colleges and universities have not properly trained their staff to train these teachers. Many teachers still feel that some students just can't learn. At the state and local level, most of what we call staff development consists of a one- to three-hour workshop on excellent subject areas, but these efforts lack depth and have almost no follow-up.

Many of the programs that seem to be effective, such as HOTS, Comer Model, Reading Recovery, and Success for All, have built in a retraining component. The most effective National Diffusion Network (NDN) programs incorporate many characteristics of an effective Chapter 1 program and provide extensive training to implement the program. Even some of these programs could benefit from additional consultive services for teachers.

Chapter 1 will never realize its full potential until the program provides quality training and is staffed with the best teachers. Every Chapter 1 teacher who is not trained to implement a specific program, such as HOTS or Reading Recovery, should go through extensive retraining on how to design and implement an effective Chapter 1 reading program. In North Carolina, prekindergarten teachers are strongly encouraged to attend a week-long institute prior to implementing a Chapter 1 pre-K program. If this type of in-service were provided for every reading teacher before he or she was allowed to design or implement a Chapter 1 reading program, our results would be much different.

JAY K. DONALDSON
State Coordinator, Chapter 1
Utah State Office of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah

Historically, Chapter 1 has had two thrusts. First, to serve the needs of low-income students in LEAs nationwide; second, to provide funds to meet the needs of concentrated populations of low-income students. Personally, we believe that both thrusts are important and should be supported with federal funds.

Millions of students have received valuable assistance from supplementary Chapter 1 instructional services that have been provided for LEAs. Deprivation resulting from low income adversely affects children and youth regardless of the state or region where they live, the color of their skin, or the language spoken in the home. Chapter 1 has helped children acquire academic skills that they desperately need from services provided in one-to-one tutoring or in small group settings. A secondary but important benefit from Chapter 1 has been the personalized attention that these children have received from caring professionals and paraprofessionals.

Children in certain circumstances or in neighborhoods where there are high concentrations of low-income children combined with other problems—e.g., high crime rates, substance abuse, limited English usage, culturally different ethnic groups—have unique educational needs. Both regular and supplementary educational services should be tailored to meet the complex needs of students in such circumstances.

We tend to associate concentrations of low-income children with depressed inner-city areas, but children living on remote Indian reservations or in economically blighted regions of the country have comparable needs.

CHAPTER 1 FORMULA INEQUITIES AND RELATED ISSUES

Basic LEA Chapter 1 Grants

Chapter 1 was designed to address the needs of low-income children, but the allocation of federal moneys among states is extremely inequitable. Included in the Chapter 1 formula are provisions that are inconsistent with delivering services to low-income children. First, factors are included that have no bearing on the cost of providing educational services: e.g., additional count allowances for states that make higher Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) payments. This biases allocations in favor of states that are more affluent. AFDC payments have no bearing on the cost of delivering Chapter 1 educational services. This is like giving citizens in one state more votes than in another state.

- ***We recommend that each low-income child be counted only once regardless of the state where he or she lives. Differences in the cost of delivering services among states must receive consideration. The average teacher's salary in each state may be the best indicator of costs, since salaries and fringe benefits account for a high percentage of the cost to operate Chapter 1 programs.***

As a result of current formula inequities, some states receive one-third to one-fifth of what other states receive. For example, in 1989 Utah received $33.03 per pupil, compared with the national average of $96.51 per pupil. New York State received $167.19 per pupil.[2] Inequities in the Chapter 1 formula significantly limit the number of schools, grades, subjects, and children that can be served in Utah.

Chapter 1 Concentration Grants

The percentage of low-income children in school districts or in specific schools should be used as the primary factor in the formula regarding how these funds should be allocated. The higher the percentage, the greater its weighting.

- ***A rationale should be used to determine the weighting that is given to specific factors in the allocation formula, e.g., language, cultural differences, isolation.***

INAPPROPRIATE USE OF CENSUS DATA IN CHAPTER 1 ALLOCATION FORMULA

The ten-year interval between census taking makes census data an inappropriate primary basis for low-income count in addressing current student needs. If the census is used, the allocation formula needs to be modified every two or three years through the use of more current low-income data, such as free lunch count, which is collected on a regular basis.

The analysis of census data by the Census Bureau is too slow. Adjustment of the low-income-child count from the 1970 census and 1980 census did not occur until FY 1974 and FY 1984, respectively. This was a three and one-half-year delay in the use of low-income-count data. If the Census Bureau cannot analyze and report child low-income information within a year to 14 months, the analysis should be contracted out to private data-processing companies.

POSSIBLE REFORMULATION OF CHAPTER 1 LEGAL PROVISIONS

If certain activities were carefully planned, we believe that approval of waivers regarding how Chapter 1 funds and services might be provided should be permissible under certain circumstances. When school districts decide to change curriculum or to restructure the program to improve the quality of education for its students, such activities are usually accomplished districtwide. Chapter 1 is restricted to providing services in low-income schools only. Current legal provisions don't permit Chapter 1 to participate in such improvement efforts whether such changes are beneficial for Chapter 1 children or not.

---

[2] *The Distribution of Federal Elementary-Secondary Education Grants Among the States*, interim report on the study mandated by Congress in P.L. 100-297, Sec. 6207, U.S. Department of Education Contract No. LC89015001, Table 16, p. 3-40.

- ***We would favor limited participation of Chapter 1 in curriculum and instructional improvement efforts districtwide when the use of funds focuses on paying consultants or developing curriculum to meet the needs of low-performing students. The involvement in such activities would facilitate the coordination of supplementary services between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom.***

Current regulations are analogous to telling a mechanic he can work on the right side of the car but not on the left side, or on the front of the car but not on the back. Current legal provisions make it awkward for Chapter 1 to influence or participate in broad-based improvement efforts under current requirements.

There is a national move to give school personnel more authority to make site-based management decisions.

- ***We would favor waivers of Chapter 1 requirements similar to those allowed for schoolwide projects to more schools, provided that accountability provisions similar to those mandated for schoolwide projects are continued. Possibly, the percent of low income, presently a 75 percent minimum, could be lowered to 50 percent and/or the length of such projects could be reduced to a two-year period.***

The effectiveness of Chapter 1 instruction might be increased if heterogeneous grouping were allowed on an incidental or planned basis to achieve certain goals, such as in cooperative learning or whole-language settings. However, we think this approach should be used to accomplish specific objectives rather than to provide regular instruction.

JOHN ELLIS
Commissioner
Department of Education
Trenton, New Jersey

SHORTCOMINGS AND ELIGIBILITY

Needless to say, we in New Jersey are strongly committed to the success of Chapter 1. The strength of the program lies in its ideology with regard to the allocation of resources, its commitment of resources, and its determination to require and ensure accountability on the part of those charged with providing needed supplemental services to children in cash-poor schools.

The shortcomings of the program stem from its emphasis on a deficit model for defining a student's instructional needs. Such a model implies that there is something wrong with the student rather than with the conditions of learning. We would like to see learning plans built on students' strengths, including the strengths of their families and cultures, and derived from the assumption that all students can learn at high levels and can profit from enrichment and even acceleration.

The current regulations governing Chapter 1 give rise to serious concerns. It is to be hoped that the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) will address such issues as program eligibility, settings for instruction, the content, mode and quality of instruction, parent involvement, and staff development.

TESTING AND THE NEED FOR WRITING SKILLS

Current eligibility for Chapter 1 is determined by the use of multiple measures, but the specific measures used vary so widely that the only constant is the required standardized test. Although the standardized tests used also vary, their nature does not. Since it is a truism that what is tested is what is taught, it would be desirable for the U.S. Department of Education to take the lead in developing model assessment (and therefore, eligibility) procedures.

Both the *what* and the *how* of assessment need to be changed. Instead of reading, mathematics, and *language arts,* we should be focusing on reading, mathematics, and *writing.* The term *language arts* is a misnomer derived from the label given to a group of subtest items on a standardized test. These items deal with mechanics, e.g., capitalization, punctuation, usage. These are support skills of writing and a necessity in the editing of final copy, but they are not, nor do they assess, writing itself.

If we truly desired to test language arts, we would be looking at a broad array of communication skills, attitudes, and behaviors. But if we are not yet ready for that, then let us at least look at some actual writing and call it by its right name.

Here in New Jersey we have developed two state tests: the Early-Warning Test (EWT), given at the end of grade eight, which looks at broad clusters of skills, and the

11th Grade High School Proficiency Test (HSPT), a prerequisite to graduation from high school. Both of these tests require actual writing.

That writing skills need to be developed and assessed is evident from the results of the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in writing. Few would question the urgency of this need, both in and of itself and as a way of improving students' comprehension of what they read in mathematics, science, and other subjects. It will be difficult to achieve the national education goals without an emphasis on writing for varied purposes and audiences.

Reading assessment, too, needs to be broadened to include assessment of the behavior of readers, as distinguished from people who are able to read but who do not. Mathematics assessment should reflect the new vision of school mathematics set forth in the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards. We have taken steps toward this also with the development of our New Jersey state tests, the EWT and HSPT.

NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY AND INNOVATION IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

With regard to instructional setting and mode, we would like to see greater flexibility in the use of the in-class model, more latitude in the design of innovation projects, and continued strong support for early childhood programs and programs that permit Chapter 1 funds to be used to upgrade whole schools.

In New Jersey, our Chapter 1 program operates on the principle that compensatory education must be brought out of isolation. Our state program improvement plan, for example, employs as its joint planning tool the training of building-level teams of regular classroom teachers, Chapter 1-funded staff, principals, and supervisors in techniques for reviewing and strengthening the Chapter 1 program in a whole-school context. Chapter 1 staff in New Jersey are also working with our Division of Urban Education to orient building-level teams to several demonstrably effective, research-based whole-school models.

Above all, we would like to see Chapter 1, while continuing to emphasize fiscal accountability, increase its emphasis on program quality. With improved assessment and identification techniques, this should be possible.

If more dollars are available—and more dollars are badly needed—we should be able to do more with parent and staff training in curriculum and instruction. We should also be able to increase our collaboration with agencies that serve families, in order to better meet some of the social and health needs that impede children's learning.

BILL HONIG

Superintendent of Public Instruction
California State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

This commentary discusses current strengths and shortcomings of service to Chapter 1-eligible children and recommends measures for reformulating these services under the 1993 reauthorization process. The California Department of Education has two staff persons on the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Task Force which addresses Chapter 1 issues; also, the Chapter 1 Committee of Practitioners in California has formulated some ideas for reauthorization. These two entities developed and gave testimony at the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization hearings presented by the U.S. Department of Education in March 1992. The enclosed commentary was based on that testimony.

Reauthorization of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Act provides a unique opportunity to consider bold ideas to reshape programs for disadvantaged youth to meet the challenge of the 1990s and beyond. Current thinking regarding the federal role in education is along the lines of "systemic reform" which has to take place before there is any meaningful improvement in the services to meet the needs of students eligible for ESEA offerings. These ideas should be woven throughout the reauthorized legislation; they include:

- The establishment of goals and standards
- Commitment to the development and delivery of strong curriculum to students
- Development and use of high-quality teaching materials, with a special focus on technology
- Authentic assessment systems to measure student, institution, and system performance
- Professional development and training for teachers and administrators.

Enacted to provide educational equity to disadvantaged children, the Chapter 1 law carries safeguards to guarantee funds for expressed purposes. Safeguards to be maintained in the reauthorized legislation include maintenance of effort; comparability; and supplement, not supplant. While ensuring that funds are targeted for children in greatest need, an effective approach to reform would allow coordination of federal and state resources to the ultimate benefit of the target populations. Critical to true systemic reform are the concepts of accountability for performance, program improvement, flexibility in program management, incentives for collaboration, data collection and funding, and staff development. These themes are interspersed in

- Accountability
- Flexibility for schoolwide programs
- Even Start literacy

- Use of current data in funding formulas
- Targeting funds
- Staff development and the role of the teacher/principal.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Any effective program accountability system should focus on improving the achievement of students in the program and reporting the results to parents. The program improvement process in Chapter 1 provides a starting point for the reform of the accountability process. Local education agencies (LEAs) must be able to demonstrate the success of their program through enhanced pupil performance, and maximum flexibility should be allowed in designing programs to ensure that success.

Student Assessment and Testing

The Department recommends that Chapter 1 assessment practices be based on national standards currently being developed. Data for the national evaluation of Chapter 1 could be obtained through a national sampling procedure at selected grade levels, rather than by the current method of testing more than 5 million students each year. If feasible, this might be done through the National Assessment of Educational Progress and/or the new national testing system.

Tests used for national evaluation would incorporate authentic, performance-based measures and would yield the percentage of students achieving specified performance standards. States could be required to specify standards of academic performance in core subjects that Chapter 1 students, along with others, are to achieve.

This activity should be done in conjunction with local advisory groups and the Chapter 12 committee of practitioners (COP). The statewide standards of performance for schools receiving Chapter 1 funds could be set for selected grade levels (e.g., grades, 4, 8, and 10). Attainment of these standards could be assessed through state-developed measures. Districts would be encouraged, but not required, to establish performance standards tied to grade-level expectancies of the regular curriculum at additional grade levels. Multiple measures could be used so as not to rely on norm-referenced tests.

To reduce reliability problems, state education agencies would be encouraged to develop multiple indicators and to look at data over several years. As in current legislation, local districts should have the final responsibility for applying the standards to determine which schools should be identified for program improvement.

Program Improvement

The present provisions of program improvement dictate that if a school fails to make progress after a four-year program-improvement cycle, the state education agency continues to provide assistance to the school until it has "sustained its achievement level," based on the standards of the state plan, for more than 12 months.

This process should be strengthened by adding other stages. Namely, a school could be identified for a second level of intervention and provided more intensive support if it failed to make "significant" progress at the end of two years. At this point, a specially trained team could work on-site for an extended period, helping to assess what has and has not been done and assisting the staff in strategically targeting areas for change and improvement. This will be at the expense of the district, not Chapter 1. This second level of intervention is necessary because some schools require additional time and intensified assistance to guarantee significant educational improvements.

A mechanism for state intervention beyond the joint plans that are required by existing law are needed to make "program improvement" more meaningful. Moreover, this intervention should include consequences when program improvement does not occur within a designated time. The designated time could be set by the committee of practitioners.

FLEXIBILITY FOR SCHOOLWIDE AND INNOVATION PROJECTS

Flexibilities inherent in the Chapter 1 schoolwide concept are consistent with goals of systemic reform, and coordination among federal programs should be expanded. However, the qualifying poverty-level percentage should be lowered to 65 percent. In California, this percentage modification would allow significantly more schools to take advantage of this program structure.

Other requirements applicable to schoolwide projects are also problematic. For example, the 100 percent maintenance-of-effort rule for state and local funding from year to year is a deterrent in these austere fiscal times. Schoolwide projects should receive the same leeway now given to the maintenance of effort in a "regular" Chapter 1 school.

Innovation projects are another key legislative flexibility that should be modified to encourage more participation. The innovation set-aside should be held at the state for distribution after an approved application from the local agencies. In addition, a percentage could be used effectively by the states for statewide intervention activities.

EVEN START LITERACY

There is an increased recognition of the interrelationships between health, well-being, and learning. Some states, including California, have initiated efforts to promote collaboration among education, health, and social service programs to address the "whole child." This reauthorization provides an opportunity for the United States Department of Education to examine and eliminate barriers to collaboration that exist at the federal level.

Specific regulations regarding coordination and collaboration have made Even Start unique and have taken education beyond the academic walls of communities. There has been some thought to merging Even Start into regular Chapter 1 and making it an entitlement program. The Department would like to see Even Start continue to operate with separate categorical authority which provides the funding through a competitive grant process.

The rationale for keeping the status quo derives from the intensity of the program and the concern that the delivering of noneducational services to families may not be appropriately addressed in regular Chapter 1. Unless there were specific guidelines and regulations placed on the use of Chapter 1 funds (perhaps a percentage of funds to be used by schools in funding Even Start programs or incentives such as technical support) to create these programs, Even Start efforts would likely be watered down.

One of the best ways to share effective practices is through the dissemination and demonstration of Even Start programs that are well designed, are innovatively integrating many community agencies and services, and have operated for several years. They should be encouraged to move toward dissemination and technical assistance to beginning programs as part of the commitment for continued funding.

Coordinated services for parents and children are vitally needed if we are to break the cycle of poverty and provide them access to a rich, successful life. What better way to demonstrate cooperation and collaboration than to share the services of successful Even Start programs with potential and new grantees? Therefore, the department recommends continued funding for successful programs.

Finally, the department recommends that the scope of literacy be expanded to include all skills that families may need to survive and become functional, contributing members of society—and not only in the areas of reading and writing, but also literacy involving creative thinking, problem solving, survival skills, conflict resolution, health and nutrition, consumer awareness, financial planning, and goal setting. In short, literacy and parenting skills need to go hand in hand.

USE OF CURRENT DATA IN FUNDING FORMULAS

Federal funds are distributed to such programs as Chapter 1 using population or poverty data from the decennial census. The absence of interim adjustments or data updates allows funds to be distributed based on data that may be up to 12 years old. With the current influx of immigrants in such states as California and the mobility of populations between and within states, a process must be developed to improve the accuracy and timeliness of demographic data to ensure that federal funds are following the populations they were designed to serve. Such a process must provide the requested county by county poverty data, at a minimum, to ensure that Chapter 1 funds are targeted to the children for whom the services were intended. Census data should be reexamined, at a minimum, every two years because of the changing populations.

The practice of counting only 5- to 17-year-olds for determining funding is not realistic; the number should include birth to 21-year-olds. Because these ages are eligible for services, they should be included when funding formulas are developed, particularly as the primary *America 2000* (1991) goal is ensuring that students are ready for school when they enter kindergarten.

TARGETING FUNDS

The current process for the selection of schools should be modified so that funds are targeted more realistically to the most economically depressed schools. This could be accomplished by allowing the districts to define "most needy," with approval from the state agency. The existing law encourages spreading moneys too thin. Better methods for targeting funds to the schools might allow the districts to define greatest need as it relates to the most economically depressed families in their area. This would mandate that the funds be concentrated where the need is the greatest instead of spreading the funds to serve more schools.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL

Research shows that ongoing staff development is an important ingredient in school change. A number of staff need frequent preservice and in-service training on techniques and strategies to work with the diversified population of students in schools today. Staff also need training on how to successfully work with parents who represent this same diversity. We therefore recommend the following relative to staff development for teachers and principals serving compensatory education students.

- Staff development should be mandated by law and become a quality and compliance issue.
- Staff development should focus on strengthening teachers' knowledge of curriculum and improving their instructional skills.
- Instructional staff should be recognized as important sources of knowledge concerning instructional practice. They should also be recognized as potential teachers of other teachers, peer coaches, mentor teachers, or teacher-leaders.
- Staff development should be viewed as an integral part of the school's mission. Sufficient time should be provided for long-term, in-depth, ongoing activities with adequate time and opportunity for follow-up.
- Teachers should have the opportunity to acquire and practice culturally sensitive and culturally inclusive pedagogy.
- Staff development for Chapter 1-funded teachers and staff should be integrated into, and coordinated with, the regular core academic curriculum.
- The unique needs of new teachers and other staff who work in Chapter 1 programs should be identified and accommodated in the planning and delivery of staff development services.

- Training on how to provide leadership for the improvement of curriculum and instruction for compensatory education students and their teachers should be available to principals to improve their knowledge and skills as instructional and administrative leaders.

JOHN HOOPER

Director, Chapter 1
Georgia Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

This commentary focuses specifically on the aspects of Chapter 1 that most directly affect services to children. State programs in Georgia are moving forward to provide increased incentives for local school systems to restructure their programs and for schools to provide improved services to their students, families, and communities. We would like to have the supplemental components of federal programs, such as Chapter 1, move in the same directions. Accordingly, the commentary addresses only those areas of Chapter 1 that will provide increased flexibility to local school systems as they seek to improve the educational opportunities and programs offered to their communities.

GAINS UNDER CHAPTER 1

Chapter 1 programs in Georgia have been generally successful over the years, consistently posting normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains in both reading and math. Chapter 1 programs are provided to eligible children in all school systems, with great variety in the type of programs and services being delivered to the eligible student population. The focus has been on improving the instructional programs and opportunities for those eligible to receive Chapter 1 resources. This is reflected in the positive NCE gains. It also reflects the fact that 95 percent of the personnel employed with Chapter 1 funding provide direct instruction to students.

While Georgia school systems have experienced successful Chapter 1 efforts, additional gains in student progress are clearly needed if the primary objectives of Chapter 1 are to be adequately addressed. The increased levels of funding, as well as the increased flexibility in providing services to eligible students, have been beneficial, and much in the current law is effective and should be maintained as structured. The following areas, however, need changing to facilitate additional growth and success in Georgia:

- Lowering the percent required to qualify for schoolwide projects
- Allowing the incidental involvement of noneligible Chapter 1 students
- Increasing the 25 percent eligibility clause to 30 or 35 percent
- Increasing the accountability in program improvement.

SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

A major concern of parents, teachers, and administrators is the identification of specific children as Chapter 1 and the removal of these children from the regular classroom to receive the supplemental services provided by Chapter 1. Washington, as well as the state, have increasingly encouraged the use of models that deliver services to the student in the regular classroom and maintain heterogeneously grouped classrooms. Schoolwide projects eliminate the individual identification difficulty and have effectively addressed the needs of students in the total school.

The eligibility percentage necessary for a school to qualify for a schoolwide project needs to be reduced from the current 75 percent required to 66 percent. Such a reduction would continue to require significant levels of economic deprivation, but it would also allow more opportunities for schools to restructure and improve their ability to address the needs of students. For schools that cannot qualify for schoolwide projects, the use of models that promote the delivery of services to the student in the regular classroom must continue to be encouraged.

Georgia has had moderate success with the in-class model; however, some unique applications of such models have been denied by the U.S. Department of Education because they incidentally involved noneligible Chapter 1 students. There needs to be increased flexibility to allow such models to be utilized in an effort to more effectively address the needs of students in an environment that fosters cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and other learning opportunities that need heterogeneous grouping to be effective.

If there are concerns regarding the potential demands that lowering the minimum percentage for schoolwide projects or the incidental involvement of noneligible students might place on the program, consideration should be given to the feasibility of raising the 25 percent eligible clause to 30 or 35 percent. This would assure more concentration of services to students in schools with higher concentrations of low-income families. The current regulation allowing the inclusion of many 25 percent schools frequently dilutes the impact of Chapter 1 in other qualifying schools.

Program Improvement

The regulations and the current law as it provides for program improvement must be reexamined and redesigned to eliminate the revolving-door phenomenon. Under current regulations, often a school will test into program improvement one year and test out the next. No real change is made in the program or the services provided to students.

The benefits of the current program improvement activities are questionable without more accountability for making a difference in the instructional program opportunities provided to students. This increase in accountability could require a school to demonstrate achievement gains in the performance of the students served over a two-year rather than the one-year period as currently required. Additional consideration could be given to building some of the program review and planning aspects of the program-improvement component into the annual needs assessment and program planning for the regular project.

ROBERT LEININGER
State Superintendent of Education
Springfield, Illinois

CONCENTRATION GRANTS

Concentration grants were earmarked for districts with high concentrations of poverty. LEAs eligible for concentration grants are those in which the number of low-income children in the district exceeds 6500 or 15 percent of the total number of public and nonpublic school children in the district in the preceding fiscal year. However, the number of districts eligible for concentration grants has not increased because the U.S. Department of Education uses outdated child counts (decennial census count, AFDC, foster child count, and private institution of neglected and delinquent) to determine the concentration grant allocation for each county.

In addition, some of these children attend nonpublic schools that are not located in the district in which the children are counted. Therefore, a district may be disqualified because children are counted in the district where they attend school rather than in the district where they reside.

The county and district concentration grants should be determined by the states based upon the best available data on low-income children at the state level. Concentration funds should be targeted to districts with high concentrations of poverty regardless of the location. In Illinois, some districts with high concentrations of poverty are not located in counties with high poverty and do not receive concentration funds.

MIGRANT PROGRAM

The migrant-education allocation formula should be revised to establish a minimum state allocation. Consideration should be given to fully funding the first 100 FTEs at the authorized funding level, or the first 100 children who are identified as currently migratory in a state. Additional students would be funded at a lower percentage level than the appropriation funds would allow.

The law should provide greater incentives for states to recruit, identify, and serve currently migratory children. The service priority for migrant education should change. Greater incentives could be encouraged by using a weighted formula for funding states by giving the following priority: currently interstate, currently intrastate, most recently settled out, longest settled out.

Other sources of information should be used to estimate counts of migratory children in the formula. In the absence of actual counts of migratory children and youth, other proxies might be used.

Through the use of Section 1203 funds, the Office of Migrant Education (OME) could set aside up to $1.25 million for the purpose of identification and recruitment of students, which in turn could affect the student count nationally. Since the student count directly affects the annual grant amount of every state, the emphasis should be focused on the smaller states. Because of the lower student counts, smaller states have less money and, consequently, less to spend in the area of identification and recruitment.

The reauthorization should provide changes in the way migrant education is evaluated. With the high mobility rate of migrant students, student data are difficult to collect, even through the electronic networking that the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) can provide. Recommendation: Eliminate the requirements for sustained gains. Instead, use alternative evaluation approaches, i.e., student portfolios, desired outcomes, etc.

NEGLECTED AND DELINQUENT PROGRAM

In the Neglected and Delinquent programs, students should have opportunities for life-skills training which would enhance the academic remediation goals traditionally associated with Chapter 1 Neglected and Delinquent programs. The average Chapter 1 student in such programs is 19 years old. These students have a much greater probability of entering the work force rather than returning to school. A focus on employability skills would allow the Neglected and Delinquent programs to use these skill areas as the core program and to also teach practical reading and mathematics skills.

CAPITAL EXPENSES FUNDS

The federal government allocates capital expenses funds to states on a formula basis. The Capital Expenses Program stimulates LEAs to provide services to private school students. A funding formula is an inappropriate method for awarding funds in this program. The number of private school children served is deceiving because many are served through computer-assisted instruction and materials instead of direct services. These services are not covered under the Capital Expenses Program.

A better model for this program would be discretionary grants. Districts that could use the funds would then apply. Funds would not be tied up in areas of the country where they would not be used. A discretionary program would require LEAs to be more creative in planning services to private schools, as there would be competition for funds. This change in the funding process would eliminate the need for states to turn back to the Department of Education all or some of their yearly capital expenses allocations.

INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

To encourage innovative programs, the reauthorization of Chapter 1 in 1988 contained a provision whereby LEAs could use 5 percent of Chapter 1 basic grant funds for innovative projects. Many districts had trouble identifying whether these programs were innovative, because the list contained in the rules and regulations of program options included many of the programs they currently were doing.

To promote innovation, state educational agencies should be provided categorical grants for innovation so that districts could apply through the application process for funding. These funds would be in addition to the basic grant.

A national bonus system could also be adopted to reward states that encouraged and provided for innovation. The federal government should also publish a different list of model activities that could be funded as innovative projects since some of the activities that can be funded under the current legislation are not considered special and LEAs do not identify them as innovative. The authorized list should provide new ideas and concepts for structuring and providing Chapter 1 services. The list could utilize information from DOE-funded demonstration projects and National Diffusion Network projects.

SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

The schoolwide option provided in the 1988 reauthorization has allowed schools to benefit a greater population of students with the outstanding methods of instruction developed for Chapter 1-eligible students. To make this option available to more schools, the percentage of poverty needed to qualify should be lowered.

With the rising number of magnet schools, large districts under desegregation plans, and the plight of small rural schools, it is difficult for schools to demonstrate 75 percent low-income, even though the school may have a high number of educationally disadvantaged students. With the lowering of the 75 percent requirement, more school districts will be involved.

PUPIL TESTING

The student assessment procedures used for Chapter 1 should be aligned with the movement of developing national standards for all children. Chapter 1 assessment practices should emphasize (1) the desired outcomes over standardized test scores and (2) the LEA's accountability toward desired outcomes.

The assessment of every Chapter 1 student in every grade level should be required as a part of ongoing Chapter 1 programs, not merely an annual reporting event. The comprehensive reporting of assessment results should be required less frequently, but at every grade level. Testing should not be the dominating method of evaluating students' progress. SEAs and LEAs should have the flexibility to choose various methods that measure students' progress.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Illinois, the Chapter 1 school-improvement process is working effectively. Program improvement has been highly effective in promoting the restructuring of programs in districts that have participated. The program has fostered collaboration between Chapter 1 and regular education staff. As a result, large numbers of buildings now participate.

The intent and design of the program improvement program should remain the same. More funds should be made available to support buildings in planning and implementing change.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The technical assistance centers (TAC) and rural technical assistance centers (RTAC) should become more research- and consultant-oriented. The RTAC as a separate technical assistance center is ineffective in a large state such as Illinois. Most rural areas are close enough to large cities to obtain staff development services provided by the state.

The technical assistance centers should provide more research and development of materials that support the SEA, rather than spending a majority of staff time and resources conducting workshops. TACs should design specialized staff-development programs to support SEA and LEA staff. Chapter 1 regulations should require SEAs and LEAs to set aside portions of the grant to support staff-development activities.

ETHEL J. LOWRY

Director, Chapter 1, ESEA
North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
Bismarck, North Dakota

Since Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was originally enacted in 1965, the legislative pendulum for the program has swung between the need to ensure the appropriate use of Chapter 1 moneys through tighter regulation and the need to eliminate requirements which impose unreasonable and/or restrictive federal rules on school districts.

In the late 1960s and again in 1981, efforts to deregulate Title I/Chapter 1 resulted in outright abuses of Chapter 1 funds. Reauthorization in 1988 again swung the pendulum back toward tighter regulation but with greater pedagogical flexibility and less restrictive federal rules.

Title I/Chapter 1 will again come up for reauthorization in 1993 and local flexibility and federal regulation will again be an important issue. Have we really tried to learn our lesson, as John F. Jennings has said, or will we again open the door to abuses of Chapter 1 funds?

Clearly Title I/Chapter 1 has had a significant and positive impact on the education of the disadvantaged and equal opportunity for all. Local districts have been given greater discretion in deciding which children to serve and how to serve them. Progress has been made in the establishment of higher standards for Chapter 1 students, program improvement, and parent involvement. The 1993 reauthorization will not, let us hope, allow districts to spend Chapter 1 moneys in inappropriate ways. However, in an effort to make Chapter 1 more flexible, innovative and less restrictive, we cannot, must not, take out all of the requirements dealing with accountability.

To quote Richard Elmore, "Fiddling with organizational structure is a favorite device of educational policymakers and administrators because it communicates to the public in a symbolic way that policymakers are concerned about the performance of the system." Let's not fiddle with Chapter 1 in a way which waters down the funds for disadvantaged children and leads to funding abuses.

In considering potential policy alternatives, let's look instead at providing allocation formulas which ensure

- Equity between and among states and districts
- Parent-involvement training for Chapter 1 staff
- Clearly stated selection criteria and additional funding for Chapter 1 so that all disadvantaged children, including LD and LEP students, can be served in Chapter 1 reading, math, and language arts classes
- Program improvement identification based on multiple data sources

- Funding incentives for effective Chapter 1 programs, as well as those programs in need of improvement
- Adequate funding for early childhood Chapter 1 programs.

MILTON D. MATTHEWS
Director, Division of Compensatory Education
Mississippi State Department of Education
Jackson, Mississippi

STRENGTHS OF THE CURRENT CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

While statistical data are not available for the number of students benefiting from participation in Chapter 1 services during the years the program has been in existence, information for the past three years indicates that approximately 375,000 educationally disadvantaged students in Mississippi have received supplementary educational services. Further, the evaluation report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education verifies that significant gains have been experienced by educationally disadvantaged students who would have not shown academic achievement had they not participated in supplementary Chapter 1 activities.

Because of Chaper 1 funding, services are offered to prekindergarten children who are determined to be in greatest need of these services in several Mississippi school districts. These programs provide readiness-type activities to prepare students for kindergarten.

Chapter 1 students in Mississippi are expected to meet academic standards that exceed those expected of non-Chapter 1 students. For instance, minimum expected gains for Chapter 1 students range from one to two NCEs, whereas zero gains are expected from non-Chapter 1 students. Chapter 1 students have made these achievements that are not necessarily the results of legislative provisions only.

Chapter 1 regulations require the attainment of gains measured by standardized tests and the achievement of district-developed desired outcomes. Those who have made achievement gains are students in schools that are addressing needed changes in programs, strategies, approaches, attitudes, and individual needs of students, not just working to increase a test score.

SHORTCOMINGS

A major shortcoming of Chapter 1 is the allocation of funds. Many school districts in Mississippi are unable to meet the needs of their educationally disadvantaged students; there are considerably more students in need of supplementary services than there are funds to provide these services.

Chapter 1 administrators and teachers are particularly concerned by assessment and evaluation procedures currently under consideration. Tremendous emphasis is being placed on using portfolios as one method for assessing needs and evaluating students' achievement.

While educators agree that methods of assessing and evaluating other than standardized test scores may be more realistic in determining needs of students, there is still great concern regarding the reporting of evaluation data to the U.S. Department of

Education. The U.S. Department of Education requires that data be provided in a manner in which measurable gains may be used to determine success of the program during a single school year and also for a three-year period.

ED OBIE

Program Manager, Chapter 1 and Migrant Education
Alaska Department of Education
Juneau, Alaska

This issues paper of the Alaska Department of Education, completed in March 1991, discusses migrant education and Chapter 1 basic programs. In Alaska, students are primarily eligible for migrant education based on moves within and among school districts, in contrast to the classic migrant student in the contiguous 48 states, where students travel among respective states as a result of their parents' transient lifestyle. This results in a skewed perception that the migrant and Chapter 1 basic are similar, when in most states they differ greatly.

The greatest concern I share with my staff is, how Chapter 1 (serving 5 percent of the total school population) can cure the ills of the larger system that it supplements, based on the belief that the larger system is failing the educationally disadvantaged students. The tail is wagging the dog: Supplemental programs are in the forefront of educational reform. There is a need to reform the basic program and integrate the respective categorical programs in a fashion that lends itself to complementing the regular program reform.

CHAPTER 1 GOALS

Chapter 1 is a federally funded educational program designed to supplement the regular school program. Financial assistance is given to school districts to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas with high concentrations of low-income families. Funds are also available to serve children in state and local institutions for neglected and delinquent children. Chapter 1 is an entitlement program with federal funds flowing through the state department of education to school districts on a formula basis. Services through the basic Chapter 1 program can be provided to children from 3 to 20 years of age.

The migrant education program is also a federally funded supplemental educational program authorized under the basic Chapter 1 program legislation. Services through the migrant education program are designed to meet the special needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers and fishers. Unlike the basic Chapter 1 program, the migrant education program is state-operated. Funds to school districts are allocated through a funding formula. Funds are also used to support state-level projects to assist districts in meeting the needs of these children. Services through the migrant education program can be provided to children from 3 through 21 years of age.

Both programs are designed to improve educational opportunities for children by helping them succeed in the regular program, attain grade-level proficiency, and improve achievement in basic and more advanced skills. In Alaska, the combined funding for the Chapter 1 and migrant education programs is $14 million annually. Services at the local level are determined through needs assessments designed and administered by the school districts.

CURRENT STATUS OF PROGRAMS

In FY 1989, 50 school districts received basic Chapter 1 program funds and provided services to 6650 students. This represents 6 percent of these districts' overall population. Approximately 60 percent of the students served were American Indian/Alaska native, 30 percent were white, and the remainder were split among the other ethnic groups.

Services were provided in grades K-12 and were primarily in basic skills (reading, math, and language arts). Students spent an average of 34 weeks in the program, with an average of 2.5 hours per week of instruction. The full-time equivalent for aides providing instruction was three times as great as the FTE for certified teachers. The average ratio of students to instructor was 3.6 to 1.

Also in FY 1989, 42 school districts received funding through the migrant education program. These districts served a total of 6530 students, or 9 percent of their overall population. Approximately 77 percent of the students served were American Indian/Alaska native, 20 percent were white, and the remainder were split among the other ethnic groups.

Sixty-five percent of the students were in currently migratory status (their qualifying move was made within the previous 12 months) and 35 percent were formerly migratory (their qualifying move was more than 12 months, but less than six years, earlier). Migrant students currently receive a priority for services; however, Alaska's statewide needs assessment indicates no differences between the Chapter 1 and migrant populations in terms of their needs.

Services were provided to migrants in grades K-12, primarily in basic skills (reading, math, and language arts). Students spent an average of 34 weeks in the program, with an average of 2.5 hours per week of instruction. The FTE for instructional aides providing instruction was nine times as great as the FTE for certified teachers. The average ratio of students to instructor was 3.4 to 1.

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Research has identified certain common characteristics of effective programs/schools. A review of the Chapter 1 programs (including migrant education programs, unless otherwise noted) against these characteristics revealed the following issues.

Leadership in Program Design and Management

Planning and program design are critical steps in achieving an effective program. Currently, Chapter 1 services are designed to meet the needs of targeted populations as required by federal regulations. This is usually accomplished through a local needs assessment. Local needs are often assessed in isolation, rather than as part of a districtwide comprehensive plan. As a result, instead of considering alternative delivery methods based on a comprehensive plan to meet student needs, districts often use funds simply to acquire additional staff.

Instead of the Chapter 1 services being an integral part of the district's comprehensive plan, the services are spread across multiple sites and may serve large numbers of students in multiple content areas. This reduces the prospect of substantial gain for students at greatest risk. Positive results are being achieved by a few school districts which have redesigned their programs to target fewer grade levels, services, and sites.

A related issue is that of overlapping services. In many cases, a single child is eligible for and served by several supplemental programs. The child may even be receiving supplemental help in the same content area through more than one supplemental program. At times it may be hard to distinguish between the child's regular program and the supplemental services being provided. Even though a child may be receiving services through multiple programs, individual and district test results may not show any level of success.

At issue here is what is most effective for the individual student. Instead of services being designed around individual or schoolwide needs, in many cases the provision of salaries for staff seems to be the overriding concern.

Ongoing project oversight is also a critical element of successful programs. While each district has someone identified to serve as coordinator for the Chapter 1 programs, his or her effectiveness may be compromised by a variety of factors. Smaller districts may not have sufficient grant funds to hire an individual specifically designated to coordinate the programs. The responsible person may have many other duties and not enough time to adequately devote to the Chapter 1 programs.

The larger, rural districts may have sufficient funds to hire a coordinator, but may have infrequent contact with the multiple, remote sites involved. Site administrators may not be actively involved in planning for and implementation of program services through the Chapter 1 programs. This may result in a lack of interest or commitment to providing the supplemental service, and the supplemental service may not adequately coordinate with the regular program or address the needs of the students.

Parent and Community Involvement

Effective schooling research continuously cites the high correlation between parental involvement and student achievement. The current legislation explicitly details the requirements for parental involvement in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Chapter 1 programs themselves. School districts have been moving toward greater parental involvement in recent years. While they may be meeting the requirements on a cursory level, there is still room for improvement.

Parents and communities need to understand the importance of education and to involve themselves in the education of their children. While the schools are responsible for schooling, parents and others in the community are responsible for working with the schools to educate children.

Effective Curriculum and Instruction

Services in the Chapter 1 programs are provided primarily by paraprofessional staff. Questions have been raised as to the quality of services delivered by instructional aides. Some researchers indicate student gains are achieved more quickly using certified teachers and content specialists rather than paraprofessionals. With already relatively low pupil-teacher ratios in most rural school districts, increasing the number of staff may be of questionable value.

Research on effective schooling shows a correlation between high student expectations and student achievement. Since the Chapter 1 programs have been viewed as remedial programs for low-achieving students, teachers and administrators may have low expectations for student success. Most Chapter 1 programs have focused on basic skills. There is a need to incorporate higher-level thinking skills into both the regular and Chapter 1 instruction and to raise expectations for student success.

A critical issue facing districts is how Chapter 1 and the variety of other supplemental programs can be used to enhance the regular program to achieve the greatest impact on students. Chapter 1 is commonly one of several state and/or federally funded supplemental educational programs operating in any given school district. The effectiveness of these programs can be judged only relative to the effectiveness of the school district's regular program. To a great extent, schools whose Chapter 1 programs are not showing positive results are also demonstrating problems schoolwide.

Students most often are pulled out to receive supplemental services. In recent years, however, an increasing number of alternative models are being used to deliver supplemental services including (1) in-class delivery, with such comprehensive classroom strategies as cooperative learning or whole-language instruction; (2) schoolwide projects; (3) extended learning time (after school and summer school); (4) reduced pupil-teacher ratio; and (5) technology-based approaches.

In most districts the services are spread across multiple sites, grade levels, and content areas. The services are diluted to such an extent that it is not possible to make achievement gains. Since it is more difficult for secondary students to make significant achievement gains, early intervention and targeting services at the younger grades may bring about more significant gains over time.

Assessment and Evaluation

Program evaluation is an important element in the improvement of Chapter 1 programs. Student achievement, measured annually, has been used primarily to meet state and federal reporting requirements. Evaluation results are seldom used for program design but are most often seen as meeting a required reporting task.

The lack of analysis of student achievement data for program improvement and student selection appears to be far more prevalent than would be deemed desirable. Student-achievement results generally are not consistent across multiple sites within school districts. Often these achievement results will show positive gains at one site, negative at another, or positive in one subject area and negative in another at the same site. Also, the Chapter 1 programs may have a required achievement standard which is not achieved by the regular program it was designed to supplement.

Recent federal legislation requires the basic Chapter 1 program to meet a state-established standard for achievement. If this standard is not met, districts must go through a process of program improvement. Funds are available, along with technical assistance from the Department of Education, to assist districts in taking a closer look at their own program and making appropriate changes which should result in positive student gains.

The process begins with building-level staff working as a group to identify their program's strengths and weaknesses in the areas of program design, curriculum and instruction, coordination with the regular program, and parent involvement. Using this information, objectives are developed to address areas for improvement. The team then drafts an improvement plan based on these elements. The draft plan also goes through a review by the rest of the faculty, parents, and local school committees before being approved by the school board. This process has been used by several districts over the last few years and has been well received. This model shows promise for use with other special programs as well as the regular program.

A major concern related to the evaluation issue is the preponderance of Alaska native and other minority children in the at-risk category of students most often eligible for Chapter 1 services. Norm-referenced tests are used almost universally statewide as a basis for needs assessment, student selection, and student evaluation, but their appropriateness has been questioned. Federal regulations recommend that districts consider alternatives to norm-referenced testing as needed to address the needs of culturally and linguistically different students. However, this is an area relatively untouched by local school districts at this time.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The following recommendations, based on effective school characteristics, apply to district actions. Actions that the Department of Education should take to support districts in their improvement efforts follow each set of recommendations.

To provide effective leadership in program design and management, districts should:

- Make supplemental programs an integral part of the district's comprehensive planning and goal setting.
  - Base annual planning on a comprehensive assessment conducted every three years.
  - Align goals, objectives, program design, and instructional materials between the supplemental programs and the regular program.
  - Review the quality of the regular program.
  - Identify ways in which supplemental programs can best be used to augment the regular program.

- Target services and resources so as to use them efficiently and for the greatest impact on student achievement.
    - Base decisions on individual or schoolwide needs rather than administrative expedience.
    - Target resources on fewer schools, subjects, or grades.
    - Eliminate duplication of services through multiple programs.
    - Implement alternative strategies to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically different students.
    - Develop clear standards for student selection into respective categorical program services and a definition for when dual services are appropriate.
- Develop a process for site-based management.
    - Involve site administrators, parents, and members of the community in the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs.
    - Conduct joint in-service training for regular and special staff in regard to program requirements.

The Department of Education should continue to offer the program review process used for the basic Chapter 1 program for program improvement and encourage districts to extend this effective approach to the regular program and other special programs.

To improve parent and community involvement, districts should:

- Develop and implement effective strategies for achieving meaningful parent involvement in the planning, design, and implementation of the Chapter 1 programs.
- Develop a positive partnership between the school district and parents and members of the community.
    - Provide parents with skills to assist them in meeting their responsibility for ensuring the success of their children in school.
    - Provide school district staff with the skills to actively involve parents in their child's education.
    - Work closely with agencies providing early childhood services to encourage parent involvement during the critical developmental years.

The Department of Education should develop a comprehensive state-level effort to assist school districts in increasing parent involvement, including identification of model programs, dissemination of effective strategies for parent involvement, and training for parents and parent advisory councils. Assistance in identifying objectives for the improvement of parent involvement and methods to assess the effectiveness of parent involvement activities should also be addressed.

To implement more effective curriculum and instruction, districts should:

- Focus the greatest instructional expertise on those in greatest need. Efforts should be made to hire certified staff or design the program so that instructional aides relieve the teacher to then provide services to the targeted students.
- Consider alternatives to pullout instruction, such as (1) in-class delivery, including comprehensive classroom strategies such as cooperative learning or whole-language instruction; (2) schoolwide projects; (3) extended learning time (after school and summer school); (4) reduced pupil-teacher ratio; and (5) technology-based approaches.
- Consider focusing services on prevention through early intervention with preschool and primary-grade children. Explore the use of effective programs such as the Family Literacy Project to raise student achievement levels.
- Incorporate advanced thinking skills into both the Chapter 1 programs and the regular program services to switch the focus from remediation.
- Increase coordination between Chapter 1 services and those of the regular program by aligning instructional materials and methods and by structuring time for staff communication and planning.

The Department of Education should identify, disseminate, and assist school districts in implementing model programs that incorporate effective strategies, in particular those addressing children aged 3 to 8.

To improve assessment and evaluation, districts should:

- Use appropriate evaluation methods to assess program effectiveness and fully utilize this information to improve services in both the regular and the Chapter 1 programs.
- Take steps to ensure that appropriate data collection and reporting methods have been used and results are reliable, valid, and accurate.
- Consider alternatives to norm-referenced testing for the selection, placement, and assessment of culturally and linguistically different students.

The Department of Education should (1) provide technical assistance to school districts on technical evaluation standards and interpreting results for improvement; (2) assist school districts in identifying appropriate evaluation instruments and methods for culturally and linguistically different students and for parent involvement; and (3) analyze and interpret data for determining statewide program effectiveness.

VIRGINIA R. L. PLUNKETT
Chapter 1 State Coordinator
Colorado Department of Education
Denver, Colorado

Chapter 1 of ESEA has been operating continually for 27 years with a good track record in improving the education of disadvantaged children. Although considerable time was spent during the first 20 years in defending the program from presidential cuts, particularly during the Nixon and Reagan administrations, much has been learned about educating children in high-poverty areas.

During spring 1982, when we were trying to forestall more budget cuts in Chapter 1, I calculated that the federal government's 17-year investment of $32.6 billion in Chapter 1 programs would likely result in $76.5 billion a year in increased tax returns as a result of the increased earning power of better educated students. This cost-effective calculation could well be updated by adding the ten-year 1982-1992 period.

With a growing number of children living in poverty and local/state education dollars becoming increasingly scarce, the Chapter 1 program is more essential than ever if we, as a nation, are to educate our children to their fullest potential. Children identified for Chapter 1 services need greater amounts of high-quality instruction, which Chapter 1 can provide, to help them catch up with their peers and succeed in the regular program of instruction.

As an educational venture, Title I/Chapter 1 has been continually interesting and challenging to many of us who have worked a long time in the program. Chapter 1 is a program that has an inspiring mission, to help youngsters from poor areas achieve, and a history of relatively stable funding with which to accomplish it. School districts do not have to compete with each other for Chapter 1 funds, and they can count on at least 85 percent of the previous year's allocation, these factors contribute to program and staff continuity.

CHAPTER 1 IN ACTION

The Title I/Chapter 1 law contains the following highly commendable elements that have been consistent throughout its history, although implementation of the law may vary from state to state.

Needs Assessment

The Chapter 1 program must be based on the needs of children, not the needs of the school as a whole or administrative needs. It must focus on "educationally deprived" children whose needs must be identified with enough specificity to ensure concentration on those needs. The needs assessment then governs the design and implementation of the program.

Size, Scope, and Quality

The law insists that Chapter 1 programs be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting the children's needs. This requirement has direct implications for the hiring of Chapter 1 staff, the Chapter 1 teacher-pupil ratio, the acquisition and use of various materials and activities that are effective in meeting the individual children's needs, the amount of time that children are actually engaged in meaningful learning activities, consideration of the ages and developmental levels of the children being served in planning the program, coordination of Chapter 1 with the regular program of instruction, staff in-service training, and parental involvement.

Coordination

The coordination of Chapter 1 with the regular classroom and other relevant programs has long been required, and properly implemented it would bring the best thinking of the regular teaching staff and the Chapter 1 staff toward improving the achievement of Chapter 1 children. The newest Chapter 1 law, P.L. 100-297, strengthened the coordination requirement, but we in Colorado have always stressed that Chapter 1 and regular classes must be coordinated.

In fact, we have an assessment checklist of instructional-quality indicators that lists specific items to coordinate, including: the purpose of Chapter 1; defining and assessing pupil needs and strengths, which means pooling pupil information on an initial and ongoing basis; determining which skills and strategies are to be taught; planning activities and materials to be used to avoid too much duplication and strive for variety; selecting content and topics to be covered (Chapter 1 teachers can ensure that Chapter 1 pupils are exposed to information about certain topics before they are introduced into the regular classroom); and coordinating communication to parents about pupil progress.

Evaluation and Program Improvement

The fact that accountability has been built into Chapter 1 since the beginning has been a major factor in program continuity. Annual reports of local/state evaluations have been compiled and sent to Congress, which has been more amenable to the continued funding of a successful program.

The requirements for program improvement, written into the 1988 reauthorization, have put operational procedures into the "size, scope, and quality" mandate. Although the process needs much fine-tuning and some better assessment instruments and school selection procedures, it has spurred closer examination of how Chapter 1 operates in a school and it has resulted in many changes and improvements with the potential for many more.

Parental Involvement

Although not contained in the original law, parental involvement was added shortly thereafter. Congress recognized that parents know a lot about their own children and the school should capitalize on this knowledge and work together with parents to improve their children's education. The main focus of the parental involvement component has shifted from empowering parents as advisers on parent advisory councils to helping parents play a larger role in the education of their children, support the school, and reinforce learning in the home.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

Evaluation and Program Improvement

National accountability must be maintained in Chapter 1. Although the current norm-referenced tests can be aggregated on a nationwide basis, there is almost universal dissatisfaction with them. One solution to this problem that has not been discussed to any great extent is to push the test publishers into producing better tests.

Reading tests developed by two states (Illinois and Michigan) follow current reading theory and would exert a positive effect upon teaching practices. Test publishers could use these as prototypes and produce similar standardized tests. These tests require the reading of long passages; the multiple-choice responses have more than one right answer; and the tests also assess the reader's background knowledge and attitude.

To increase the accuracy of identifying schools for program improvement, more than one measure should be used. One year is not long enough to make changes that go beyond the surface, so once identified using multiple measures, a minimum two-year term for a school on program improvement would help develop and anchor the improvements.

Coordination

Now that the education community is becoming more attuned to coordination and collaboration, two other agencies should be in the Chapter 1 coordination loop: adult literacy programs (to emphasize family literacy) and public libraries where Chapter 1 children can access books at night, on weekends, and in the summertime and also participate in the many library activities that are offered. In Colorado, we are strongly urging that local Chapter 1 directors ensure that all Chapter 1 children own and use a public library card. Many schools arrange for public library cards to be issued at the public schools.

Basic Skills

The focus of Chapter 1 children's achievement should be on more advanced skills, which require an underpinning of basic skills. Therefore, to reduce reporting requirements and fragmented teaching, improvement in basic skills should be omitted from the law.

Staff Qualifications

To further increase the quality of Chapter 1 programs, the law should address the issue of assigning highly qualified staff to Chapter 1 at both the local and state levels. Since some school districts still want to operate Chapter 1 programs with paraprofessionals only, although why they would hire the least-qualified personnel for children with the greatest needs defies logic, the legislation could emphasize that highly qualified professional staff members should occupy the Chapter 1 teaching positions, although paraprofessionals could be provided to assist them.

Chapter 1 and Learning-Disabled Children

Because (1) there is no uniform definition of a learning-disabled child, (2) the distinction between an LD child and a Chapter 1 child is fuzzy at best, and (3) Chapter 1 teachers are more often qualified as reading or math specialists, Chapter 1 programs should serve LD children. The service should be provided by Chapter 1 not as a supplement to Special Education services but only as a supplement to the regular classroom services. An increase in Chapter 1 funding to accommodate this proposed addition to the Chapter 1 clientele is essential.

State Administration

With all the requirements for program improvement and the need to provide even closer oversight and assistance to the increasing number of schools in some phase of program improvement, plus the continuing duties for administering the Chapter 1 program, Congress should appropriate at least the full 1 percent for state administration. It would be reasonable to add 0.5 percent specifically for program improvement activities and staff. (There is a precedent for such an action. When Congress mandated increased state monitoring and auditing, it increased Chapter 1 state administration to 1.5 percent to accommodate the additional tasks.)

These comments are offered as suggestions for revising and improving the Chapter 1 law. The history of Title I/Chapter 1 shows a strong national commitment to forming a federal/state/local partnership for improving the education of disadvantaged children. I would hope that any revisions would continue and strengthen this endeavor.

MERWIN L. SMITH
Administrator, ESEA, Chapter 1 Office
Nebraska Department of Education
Lincoln, Nebraska

CHAPTER 1 STATUTORY ISSUES

It is suggested that Section 1005(b), "Minimum Number of Children to Qualify," be changed as follows:

> (b) **Minimum Number of Children to Qualify**—A local education agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this subpart only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children counted under subsection (c):
>
> (1) In any case [except as provided in paragraph (3)] in which the Secretary determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children are available on a school district basis, the number of such children in the school district of such local educational agency shall be at least 25 [it is now 10].
>
> (2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of such children in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be at least 25 [it is now 10].

It is our opinion that ten low-income children in Section 1005(b)(1) and (2) is not a *concentration* of low-income children and the number of low-income children required for a local educational agency to be eligible for a basic grant should be changed to 25.

This comment is suggested for the purpose of providing assistance to local educational agencies that have higher concentrations of low-income families than the current statutory requirement. This suggested change should not be viewed as a request or way to reduce the current LEA allocation level but as a procedure for allocating funds to LEAs that have higher concentrations of low-income families.

It is suggested that Section 1006 "Grants for Local Educational Agencies in Counties with Especially High Concentrations of Children from Low-Income Families," Section 1017(d) "Capital Expenses," Section 1020(c) "Availability of Funds," Section 1021(c) "Discretionary Assistance," and Section 1405 "Funds for the Implementation of School Improvement Programs" be deleted from the reauthorization legislation.

Again, this comment should not be viewed as a way to reduce LEA Chapter 1 allocations. This statutory change is suggested for the purpose of consolidating, not fragmenting, Chapter 1 allocations to LEAs so that more eligible public and private schoolchildren will be able to participate in programs that are designed to meet the special educational needs of children of low-income families.

It is suggested that Section 1018(a) "Maintenance of Effort" and Section 1018(c) "Comparability of Services" be deleted from the reauthorization legislation. These statutory requirements are outdated and no longer serve any meaningful purpose in providing services to educationally deprived children that reside in low-income areas. The "Supplement Not Supplant" requirement serves the same purpose as Section 1018(a) and (c). It is not necessary to include legislation that duplicates other requirements. The two sections are administratively burdensome and require unnecessary paperwork.

If Section 1018(a) and (c) are deleted from the statute, Section 1018(d) must be revised to remove any reference made to Section 1018(a) and (c).

It is suggested that Section 1404 "Payments for State Administration" be changed as follows:

(a) **In General**—The Secretary is authorized to pay to each State amounts equal to the amounts expended by it for the proper and efficient performance of the duties under this chapter (other than Section 1021), except that the total of such payments in any fiscal year shall be the greater of the following: (1) One percent of the amount allocated to the State and its local educational agencies and to other State agencies as determined for that year under parts A and D; or (2) $500,000 [it is now $325,000].

If state educational agencies are going to be effective Chapter 1 educational leaders, SEAs must receive allocations that will adequately fund a state Chapter 1 staff large enough to properly and efficiently administer the responsibilities assigned to the state by P.L. 100-297. The responsibilities for administering Chapter 1 have greatly increased over the years without an annual state administration increase. The allocation for state administration has increased only twice since 1965.

P.L. 100-297 includes the following duties that were not required in previous Chapter 1 legislation:

- Schoolwide projects
- Increased parental involvement activities
- Capital expense
- Program improvement
- Increased regular classroom coordination
- Accountability
- Quality learning.

The Nebraska Department of Education has four staff members responsible for the program components of Chapter 1. These include assisting 330 LEAs with their Chapter 1 programs plus working with 128 LEAs in developing and implementing required LEA program-improvement plans. It is difficult for state Chapter 1 personnel to be the effective educational leaders they could be because of the heavy work load assigned to the Chapter 1 staff. The current state administration allocation does not provide enough funds to effectively administer the Chapter 1 program in Nebraska.

It is suggested that the minimum allocation for state administration be increased from $325,000 to $500,000. This could be accomplished by increasing the minimum state administration allocation and decreasing the amount the larger states receive. The result of this type of an adjustment would not cause an increase in the total state administration allocation. It would distribute the allocation so that all states, large and small, could become more effective educational leaders.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND ISSUES

In an attempt to meet the five general principles and issues listed and the broad range of opportunities that federal programs could fund, it seems most inappropriate to divide federal dollars among 50 different programs, each with separate agendas and requirements. Promoting world-class standards for all students, systemic reform, enriching curriculum, high-caliber instruction, etc., will require an integrated, coordinated, systemwide effort for the LEAs. This cannot be accomplished with multiple, categorically funded programs.

While it may not be feasible to combine all of these programs into one, it should be possible to group those with similar purposes. Where possible, formula grant programs may be more appropriate to ensure that educational opportunities are available to those students living in areas of greatest need. Combining programs would reduce administrative time and paper burden for both SEAs and LEAs.

As schools attempt to restructure and improve educational opportunities, there needs to be an avenue for SEAs to waive federal regulations and requirements to assist in their efforts. Too often, the regulations of federal programs provide the biggest obstacles to school innovative efforts.

CHAPTER 1 ISSUES: RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 1 Grants

- The Secretary of Education should consider alternatives to the use of decennial census data as the basis for allocating funds. For example, the free and reduced-price lunch program would provide data that are more up-to-date than census data, which may be five or even ten years old.
- States should be given the authority to use the best low-income data available to distribute Chapter 1 funds in order to address formula inequities or mitigating hardships caused by the allocation formula used by USDE.
- The Secretary of Education should consider allowing the states the authority to distribute the state Chapter 1 allocation based on the best available low-income data using school district boundaries. The statute should define what a high concentration of low income is, such as a school must have a 25 percent low-income concentration.
- Consideration should be given to selecting school attendance centers using student attendance rather than residency. The eligibility of private schoolchildren

would need to be based on the public school they would attend if they were not attending a private school.

- There may be some advantages to using educational, rather than economic, deprivation for selecting schools and children. Using educational deprivation would place the programs in the schools that have the greatest need for special assistance and the two procedures, selecting schools and children, would be correlated. The use of educational deprivation for school selection might provide services to highly concentrated low-income areas. It would be difficult to determine a common educational deprivation indicator for each participating school district.
- If LEAs have used or are using multiple indicators to assess student needs, the current statutory requirements have worked effectively.

Program Services

- The law should incorporate incentives designed to stimulate experimention with alternatives to these practices. SEAs should be allowed to use Chapter 1 excess funds to stimulate experimentation.
- SEAs and LEAs should be allowed to determine the service-delivery model and the pupil-testing procedure. Schools would be encouraged to experiment with alternative practices if the current reliance on standardized achievement tests for program-improvement identification were removed. The use of desired outcomes based on program design and service delivery should determine program effectiveness and subsequent need for improvement.

Program Improvement

- The use of standardized test scores (aggregated NCE gains) as a measure of program effectiveness is not appropriate for a program that requires coordinated instruction with the classroom and more advanced thinking skills. School districts should be allowed to design their own desired outcomes, approved by the SEA in the application, which reflect and include alternative assessment of student progress.
- For the most part, the school-improvement process is working effectively. The primary obstacle to even greater effectiveness is the negative connotation involved in the identification process. All school districts should include program improvement in their application and local annual review process without the distinction of being identified as being in program improvement.
- The statute should not mandate higher minimum standards or desired outcomes for student achievement. Nor should the use of a particular measure (or measures) of program effectiveness be required. Each SEA should establish state standards. Each LEA should establish desired outcomes based on their needs and program design, which would be approved by the SEA in the application process.

- The statute should require that the standards or desired outcomes be increased over time, in order to bring about sustained program improvement. The evaluation of program effectiveness should be a part of the local annual review and should include longitudinal studies.
- Regardless of the desired outcomes established by the school district, the requirement to identify schools annually is a paper burden for both LEAs and SEAs. The data should be reviewed over a period of several years. This would be particularly beneficial to programs in small LEAs.
- The funds currently earmarked for program improvement should be merged with the basic grants and distributed to all schools. The separate accounting required now is a real paper burden for both LEAs and SEAs.
- Program improvement might be more likely to occur if funds were provided to schools that demonstrated improvement rather than to those that need to improve.
- The program-improvement planning year should not be eliminated. If program improvement is the intent of this legislation, then planning is the first step to achieving high expectations.
- Schools should be required to show improvement for two years, rather than being allowed to leave program-improvement status after a single year.
- SEAs should have the authority to use excess funds, rather than the 5 percent requirement, for LEA innovation projects.

Fiscal Requirements

- Current Chapter 1 requirements related to maintenance of effort, supplanting, and comparability of services have failed to operate effectively. The maintenance of effort and comparability of services requirements have created administrative burdens for LEAs, and they should be deleted in reauthorization legislation. The supplanting requirement should incorporate enough flexibility to allow LEAs to use alternative delivery systems so that the accountability requirements are properly balanced with the needs of educationally deprived children and the LEA's curriculum.
- The statute should not require states or LEAs to match all or a portion of the federal funds. This would eliminate Chapter 1 very quickly. States and LEAs do not have the funds or the capability of raising funds to match all or a portion of the federal funds.

Capital Expenses

- ***As stated above, the capital-expense requirement should be deleted and these funds should be used to increase the basic grant so that more eligible Chapter 1 children (public and private) will be able to participate in Chapter 1.***

Even Start

- ***All funds from Even Start should be merged with the Chapter 1 basic grant and distributed to all schools so that services to preschool children can be increased. The current system greatly increases the paper burden for both the SEA and LEAs.***

Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act

- States should no longer be required to gather census data on homeless children and youth for the following reasons: (1) no direction has been given about how to generate an accurate and unduplicated count; (2) counting is a shallow response to the severity of the problems of the homeless; (3) the U.S. Census Bureau spent millions in an attempt to count the homeless and admitted that the count was incomplete; (4) there are discrepancies from state to state and different people count different groups; and (5) the National Coalition for the Homeless supports dropping the count, as do the USDE and other groups.

- Possible alternative methods for obtaining numbers of homeless children include having USDE contract with demographers to conduct an annual sampling of different localities across the country or having the Interagency Council take over the counting.

- The increased state-plan requirements provide an effective tool for the development of state strategies in educating homeless children.

- The required specific percentages of funds to be spent on "primary activities" and "related activities" are too rigid. Applicants should be able to develop a program that best meets the needs in their community. Applicants would need to provide support for their requests. The law is ambiguous about the transportation problem. The "comparable services" may equate to "no service" for homeless children in some areas. Children learn from a planned curriculum that follows a sequential advance to higher skill levels; those who move are taken out of this sequence. Thus, transportation to keep a child in his/her previous school, if at all possible, is a first step in serving the student.

- If McKinney Act programs were combined into a consolidated grant program for the homeless, the primary focus would be on meeting basic needs, i.e., housing and health services. While this is appropriate, it might become the *only* focus. The education of homeless children and helping them find their way out of the poverty cycle would get lost in the shuffle.

THOMAS SOBOL
Commissioner of Education
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York

FUND CHAPTER 1 IN FULL AND RETAIN BASIC PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The greatest shortcoming of Chapter 1 is the failure to fund the program at the authorization level. In 1992-1993, the basic grant to New York State was $596,607,175, but if the Chapter 1 basic grant had been funded at the full authorization level, New York State would have received $1,549,222,133. This means that the Chapter 1 basic grant was underfunded by $952,614,958 in New York State.

These cold numbers translate into large numbers of real children who live in poverty and have special needs relating to educational deprivation, but who are not served because of insufficient resources. The answer is not more sophisticated ways of targeting scarce resources, but the necessary leadership at the national level to ensure that sufficient funding is provided to serve all of our children in need. To do less is to fail our children, our nation, and the future of this society.

The primary and essential elements of the current Chapter 1 program have proven effective over more than a quarter of a century, and they should be continued. While the basic structure should be maintained, the legislation must provide flexibility so that legislative and regulatory rigidity will not hinder education reform and innovation.

RETAIN AND STRENGTHEN NEW INITIATIVES OF 1988 REAUTHORIZATION

Schoolwide Projects

The schoolwide-project initiative in the 1988 legislation has provided a major impetus for educational reform and comprehensive school improvement in our most economically disadvantaged schools. The New York State Legislature passed legislation in 1991 to authorize use of state compensatory education funds to further support this important effort. To date, 122 schools in New York State are implementing schoolwide projects, and that number is expected to increase.

To expand this program to more schools, the State Education Department recommends lowering the eligibility criteria from 75 percent in poverty to 60 percent. We believe, from our experience, that the integrity of the program will be maintained, yet the benefits of participation will be extended to many additional buildings and children.

Program and Student Improvement

The program and student improvement requirements in the 1988 legislation have caused many school districts and buildings to reexamine their compensatory education programs and initiate new directions for improvement. Overall, the requirements have had a positive effect, and the New York State Education Department recommends their continuation.

The funds required to effect large-scale improvements in the most impacted schools, however, are insufficient and should be increased. Increased funding would allow more concentrated technical assistance from the state agency and other providers, as well as resources for adoption of effective programs and practices.

Even Start

The highly innovative and well-received Even Start family literacy program has created a high level of interest in New York State. This intergenerational approach to working with children and adults simultaneously offers a most promising alternative to breaking the cycle of poverty and low educational achievement.

The New York State Education Department is strongly committed to implementing Even Start as envisioned in congressional authorization. The department has established a management team approach to implementation, which includes adult basic education, early childhood education, parent and community involvement, special education, and Chapter 1 components. The department strongly recommends expanded funding of Even Start to respond to the demand that has been created for this program.

In addition, the Department strongly recommends that the U.S. Department of Education provide training, technical assistance, and information sharing on a national level to ensure consistent and effective implementation of the family literacy model inherent in Even Start.

Early Childhood Intervention

The 1988 reauthorization provided additional impetus and stress on the advantages of using Chapter 1 funds for early childhood intervention. Consistent with this federal direction, New York State established early intervention as a recommended priority for local education agency Chapter 1 programs. The state undertook efforts to coordinate its state-funded pre-K program with the Chapter 1 authority to provide services to the maximum number of children consistent with the available funds.

During 1990-1991, over 11,000 children received Chapter 1 pre-K services, and over 26,000 children received supplemental services in kindergarten. Together, the pre-K and kindergarten children served represent nearly 10 percent of all children receiving Chapter 1 services in New York State.

In spite of the substantial increase in both the number and percentage of children receiving Chapter 1 pre-K and kindergarten supplemental assistance, many more children can and should be receiving early intervention services. Local school districts in New York State continue to experience difficulties in implementing and/or expanding early childhood services because of both the needs of children in later grades and the erosion of fiscal support due to current economic conditions.

To address this problem, the State Education Department recommends that the number of children to be counted for Chapter 1 allocation purposes be changed from the current ages 5-17 to ages 3-17. We further recommend that an additional appropriation (above the current appropriation) be identified and targeted to services for the 3- and 4-year-old children identified in each state and local education agency. Adding the count of 3- and 4-year-old children to the current count of 5-17 would clearly emphasize that Chapter 1 services can be used for early intervention.

REEXAMINE AND REVISE PROGRAM EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARDS

The continued use of standardized, norm-referenced testing instruments as the primary vehicles for Chapter 1 evaluation and accountability requirements is problematic for both state and local education agencies. While the need for comparable and compatible outcome data on a national level is both recognized and supported, there is growing consensus that the liabilities associated with such testing may outweigh the benefits. The following is recommended:

- Continuation of the provision that Chapter 1 projects that serve preschool, kindergarten, and first grade students shall not be subject to standardized, norm-referenced testing requirements for students in those grades
- Continuation and expansion of U.S. Department of Education initiatives, in collaboration with state and local education agencies, to develop viable alternatives to standardized, norm-referenced tests to determine outcomes of Chapter 1 programs
- Modification of evaluation requirements to allow *statewide* sampling of Chapter 1 program and student outcomes at the discretion of each state in order to provide valid national comparisons
- Modification of Chapter 1 program and student improvement requirements to allow other desirable outcomes to be used in conjunction with aggregate performance outcomes to determine buildings required to implement program improvement plans
- Development and expansion of training and technical assistance to LEA teachers and administrators to improve the quality and links between instruction and assessment.

HELP LEAS MEET CAPITAL EXPENSES RELATED TO FELTON DECISION

Providing equitable Chapter 1 services to students attending private, denominational schools remains a major problem for LEAs because of the constraints imposed by the

Felton decision. The New York State Education Department recommends continuation of additional assistance for capital expenses to LEAs to assist in overcoming the serious burdens imposed by the *Felton* decision.

WAYNE TEAGUE
State Superintendent of Education
Alabama Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama

The goal of the Alabama State Department of Education is for Chapter 1 reauthorization to give school districts the flexibility needed to impact on the total instructional program. In response to the specific topics of the RAND study, I offer the following comments.

A PROGRAM FOR LOW-INCOME STUDENTS

First of all, I do not understand why RAND refers to Chapter 1 as a program for low-income students. Chapter 1 was never for the education of low-income children because not all low-income children are educationally deprived. Even in a schoolwide project (the only place we are allowed to serve ineligible children), the evaluation is limited to the low achievers.

If the reauthorization changes the program emphasis to delivering funds and services to school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families, what happens to school districts that have high concentrations of poverty but not large numbers? How will I determine the academic success of the "new" program? How will I know that the "new" program is better?

I have had problems with "large numbers" before. You may remember how the federal government in years past suppressed statistics from small school districts even though small districts collectively educated a significant portion of the national enrollment. Such well-meant errors mislead thinkers who base their recommendations on edited statistics to believe that never happens in rural areas.

CHANGES IN THE EXISTING FORMULA AND SCHOOL FINANCE LEVER

In fiscal equity suits, only state and local funds are at issue; low-revenue-producing school districts are careful not to publicize that with federal funds their total expenditures may nearly equal the best. If the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization is going to address fiscal equity, Chapter 1 could set a good example by paying the same amount per formula child in every state, instead of giving the largest grants to states that already have the highest per pupil expenditure.

Local Services

There is no sentiment in the field for limiting the number of schools offering Chapter 1. The present law does not require serving all eligible schools. Please remember that federal courts ordered the busing that scatters our target children all over the district. Should the law now make it impossible for Chapter 1 to serve these displaced children?

Concentration on a few schools fits well with the U.S. Department of Education's current operating policy of pushing Chapter 1 services to ineligible children through schoolwide projects, preschool and at-risk. Won't this end by reducing the total number of low achievers served by Chapter 1?

FACILITATE SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT

The U.S. Department of Education may design its policies to reflect common problems, but no problem is universal. National goals and priorities should be answered and made the basis for the program evaluation, but specific remedies do not belong in the law.

Alabama has 198 schools with children from low-income families greater than 75 percent, but only 58 (29 percent) of those 198 schools report educational deprivation greater than 75 percent. One of the schools which actually operates a schoolwide project has fewer than 25 percent of its enrollment identified as educationally deprived. I believe the law should require at least 60 percent of the students in a schoolwide project to be educationally deprived.

EMPHASIS ON NONTRADITIONAL SERVICES

Some low-achieving students may benefit from nontraditional services, more accurately described as traditional services from nontraditional sources. Will these benefits show as increased academic achievement?

I would like to see us continue as our goal for Chapter 1 children to improve the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping them attain grade-level proficiency and succeed in the regular program. To do this, I believe we need to serve those children who can obtain this goal within three years. Chapter 1 must be dedicated to closing the gap between achievement and ability.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Austin, Texas

The Texas Education Agency seeks to develop and support a learning environment for learners of all ages with the goal of attaining excellence and equity in performance for everyone served by the Texas public education system.[3] The agency and the State Board of Education envision a state whose first priority is its children. The vision is limited neither to schools as they currently exist nor to education. The Texas public education system is to be one in which:

- Schools vary widely in practice, site, and curriculum delivery in response to the needs of their students.
- Teachers have the responsibility, the training, and the resources to efficiently guide developmentally appropriate instruction.
- Performance, rather than process, determines advancement.
- Performance and socioeconomic status are unrelated.
- Adults can enhance their job and life skills.

It is believed that there cannot be meaningful and appropriate excellence in education without focused concern for equity in the education of students whose school success has not been adequately assured through the traditional general education system. Many of the major programs authorized under the Hawkins-Stafford Act and other education programs which are to be reauthorized are intended to address the issue of equity.

It is within the context of the above precepts that the Texas Education Agency presents statements of principle which will guide its general and specific review of the components of the Hawkins-Stafford Act and its development of, or response to, proposals for changes and modifications during the reauthorization process.

As a vehicle for use in framing these principles, the Texas Education Agency will utilize the framework chosen by the Hawkins-Stafford Reauthorization Task Force of the Council of Chief State School Officers to address the major issues contained in the reauthorization.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION

Modifications to the Hawkins-Stafford legislation must involve a major paradigm shift whereby the learning of all students is nonnegotiable, but nearly everything else is. The education system must move from a deficit model which suggests that something is lacking in, or wrong with, an academically unsuccessful student which needs to be repaired in order for the student to achieve. This model erroneously implies that the solutions to closing the gap lie in somehow changing the students rather than changing the manner in which they are educated. The deficit model currently pervades state and federal statutes, regulations, and funding mechanisms.

---

[3] This commentary represents the official position of the Texas Education Agency on the reauthorization of the ESEA. It was submitted as a position paper to Dr. John T. McDonald, Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education, on April 2, 1992.

Future educational programs must eliminate the deficit model and focus on improvements which restructure schools so that they can better adapt to the needs of each student and build on student strengths so that all students attain the same desired outcomes or better. Therefore:

- Changes must promote this paradigm shift to the fullest possible extent.
- Changes must move away from, or eliminate completely, requirements that result in labeling students (e.g., economically or educationally disadvantaged, low-income, at-risk, etc.). Such labeling and consequent tracking systems frequently result in low achievement expectations and low performance.
- Changes must address the often negative effect of categorical programs for "protected" students which limit their learning opportunities.
- Changes must eliminate funding restrictions (e.g., supplement-not-supplant, comparability determinations, excess cost requirements, etc.) which create barriers to or impede progress toward meaningful educational reform for the benefit of all students.
- Changes must remove the negative effects of the legal/regulatory restrictiveness associated with most of the special programs in exchange for an increased focus on the performance of students.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT THROUGH SYSTEMIC CHANGE

Modifications to the Hawkins-Stafford Act must be based on performance rather than process outcomes to achieve stated expectations. While access to appropriate educational programs for all students continues to be of significant importance, concentration of effort needs to be increased toward the identification of real-world, world-class expectations and the structuring of education to help students meet performance outcomes. Both federal and state legislation and regulations in the special program areas tend to be process- rather than outcome-oriented. The accountability systems relate to fiscal and program processes rather than to the performance of students.

The ultimate intent of the Hawkins-Stafford programs should be to improve student learning and performance and to produce responsible citizens.

- Changes must involve the restructuring of administrative entities and programs to support an outcomes-based model.
- Changes should establish a student assessment system based on real-world, world-class outcomes. The assessment system should emphasize the performance of tasks, projects, portfolios, and criterion-referenced testing. Requirements for norm-referenced tests should be eliminated entirely.

- Changes should extend assessment and instruction of students to include real-world outcomes rather than rely solely on the traditional academic subject areas.
- Changes should permit the use of national or state standards or indicators of performance for state and local education agency accountability.
- Changes should include significant resources for professional development for state, local, and intermediate educational agencies, to assist staff in restructuring schools and programs to achieve desired outcomes.

Modifications to the Hawkins-Stafford Act must provide deregulation and flexibility for states and local education agencies with comprehensive accountability systems targeted on student learning, and they must encourage effective educational practices and reform. Achieving compliance with various rules and regulations has become an institution. It has become the end. It requires extensive resources which could be better used to train teachers and teach students.

The original intent of the various rules was to achieve or force some sort of outcomes, but these prescriptive laws and rules now often create barriers to effective student performance. Funding requirements maintain a status quo program and offer few options for flexible and creative programs to meet constantly emerging needs. Therefore:

- Changes must provide for an intensive review of statutes, rules, and regulations in order to delete/change those provisions which are process- rather than outcome-based and to delete those that do not have any real value other than to maintain some bureaucratic control of a program.
- Changes must give serious consideration to extensive regulatory relief to states and schools with determined student outcomes and accountability.
- Changes must not allow the federal government to use its funds to achieve fiscal equity in the distribution of funds among the states and among the school districts within each state.
- Changes must include a fair and reasonable distribution of federal funds to the states. Any consolidation of fund sources must be accompanied with strong assurances to continued funding levels commensurate with the levels at which the programs would have been funded as separate entities.
- Changes must consider elimination of certain fiscal constraints within various federal special-program funds (e.g., supplement-not-supplant, comparability, maintenance of effort, and set-asides) which adversely affects program flexibility and encourages program segregation. (Aggregate main maintenance of effort either at the state or local level will meet the intent of the law.)

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT SUPPORT

Modifications of the Hawkins-Stafford Act should encourage, but not specifically prescribe in statute, effective educational practices and reform. Legislation should encourage change which would improve student performance. However, specifically prescribing specific structures, practices, or methodologies stagnates and limits the creation of what could be even more effective practices.

It is very important during this time of concentrated educational reform that the Hawkins-Stafford Act act as a catalyst toward achieving excellence and equity in education for all students. Additionally, the myriad of existing federal programs and components of programs should be organized to ensure more-coordinated implementation of programs. Therefore:

- Changes must be reviewed to ensure there are no inhibitors to current or emerging effective practices or reforms.
- Changes must be sensitive to the unique conditions of individual states in such areas as growth and location (e.g., border states).
- Changes should encourage, but not prescribe:
    - capacity building at the state and local level
    - professional development at all levels
    - parental involvement and family literacy
    - shared decisionmaking
    - coordination with social service agencies
    - site-based management
    - research and development
    - identification and dissemination of projects that work
    - expanded use of "learning technologies"
    - development of curriculum frameworks
    - development of standards and assessments.
- Changes in the organizational structure of the above instructional support components may be necessary. Structural changes to the Hawkins-Stafford Act would provide more streamlined, flexible, coordinated, and effective assistance. Perhaps, some of the components described above, because of their importance, deserve to be described as individual Titles in the law, or several components might be included as individual components of each program's Title.

With the increased recognition at the national, state, and local levels of the interrelationship between health, well-being, and learning, collaboration between education and social services programs has become a key concern. The reauthorization of the Hawkins-Stafford Act will itself be an exercise in coordination and integration of federal education programs, with the ultimate objective of meeting the goal of increased student performance, thus reforming whole systems to raise the academic performance of America's students. Collaboration, as a strategy for reform, though as yet unproven, is worth pursuing. Therefore:

- Changes must allow for school-based collaboration in all federal programs as necessary, including the recognition of need for flexibility in administration of these coordinated programs.
- Changes must consider the need for all state and local applications for funds to contain provisions for the implementation of school-based collaboration strategies such as:
    - establishment of state and local interagency coordination councils, etc.
    - increased efforts in identification of compatible programs and how they integrate into the coordinated collaborative effort
    - identify specific barriers (at both state and local levels) to the successful coordination of services
    - delineate specific waivers of national, state, and local laws and regulations necessary to ensure effective and efficient coordination.
- Changes as they relate to the use of technology and to the use of funding for training to multiagency personnel must be recognized.

SUMMARY

It is the intent of the Texas Education Agency to do an extensive review of the current Hawkins-Stafford legislation and accompanying regulations using the above-stated issues and principles as a guide. Specific recommendations will be made with regard to needed changes. These issues and principles will also be used to review any proposed changes that result from the reauthorization process.

These issues and principles represent the agency's current general position with regard to the reauthorization of the Hawkins-Stafford Act. The Texas Education Agency intends to collaborate with the efforts of the Council of Chief State School Officers and to coordinate with that organization concerning both the content and schedule for responses.

5

Chapter Five

SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS

LYNN BECKWITH, Jr.
Executive Director, State and Federal Programs
St. Louis Public Schools
St. Louis, Missouri

Chapter 1 of ESEA, since its inception as a part of the Great Society Program, has had a profound impact on school districts and eligible and identified students across the nation. The ideals set forth in the initial legislation and the financial resources authorized and appropriated for the program have allowed school districts to address many of the unmet educational needs of the students that are served. Chapter 1 of ESEA has a proven track record that strongly supports its reauthorization in 1993.

In my judgment, the strengths of the program are as follows:

- Targeting services to eligible children in greatest need by using the worst first concept.
- Providing concentration grants to school districts with at least 20 percent of their students on AFDC. This has been particularly helpful to urban school districts.
- Allowing schoolwide projects in attendance areas that have a minimum of 75 percent of students economically disadvantaged. Eliminating the school district match in 1988 has allowed many more schools to participate.
- Strengthening the requirement for parental involvement has given parents a sense of increased importance in the program.
- Allowing school districts greater flexibility in providing preschool services to eligible and identified children has helped children succeed academically in school.
- Implementing the Chapter 1 practitioners advisory council at the state level. This has provided a mechanism for input into state guidelines before they are final.
- Providing increased flexibility in using Chapter 1 funding to support the services of counselors, social workers, etc., to address the multiple needs of eligible and identified children.

- Allowing school districts to use a variety of methods to identify school-attendance areas for Chapter 1 services. The 25 percent rule has been particularly helpful.
- Providing adequate funding that allows for a low teacher/pupil ratio has helped immeasurably in addressing individual differences.
- Allowing school districts to use multiple criteria for identifying eligible children for services, as opposed to simply using a standardized test score, has been very helpful.

While Chapter 1 does have many strengths that make it the quality program that it is, there are weaknesses that need to be addressed, including:

- Mandating program improvement to ensure accountability is laudable, but the mechanism for doing this needs fine-tuning. Too much time is spent in meeting paper requirements of the mandate.
- Mandating that children with related special needs as identified through Chapter 1 and special education be served separately through the creation of artificial barriers is not in the best interest of either program.
- Allowing school districts to be eligible to receive Chapter 1 funds if there are ten or more children from families below the poverty line dilutes the impact of the funding.

As I envision it, the following recommendations may lead to improvement in the programs funded through Chapter 1:

- Direct state departments of education to allow school districts more flexibility in taking advantage of a three-year application cycle. This would drastically cut down on the hours spent in repetitive paperwork.
- Reduce the economic deprivation level for schoolwide projects from 75 percent to 65 percent. This would allow even greater participation in this innovative program.
- Refine the accountability factors for program improvement to make it more than just a paper exercise.
- Continue to press for more preschool education and improved coordination with such programs as Head Start.
- Increase the flexibility that would allow such federal programs as special education and Chapter 1 to maximally focus services on children served by both programs.
- Increase the flexibility to serve high school students. Some state departments of education create artificial barriers to make it harder for high school students to qualify for services.
- Continue to increase the funding in an effort to cut back drastically on the number of students now eligible but unserved.

- Increase from 10 to 20 the number of eligible students needed to qualify in a school district for Chapter 1 services.

In closing, Chapter 1 of ESEA is the best federal education program in existence for meeting the needs of economically and educationally deprived children. It deserves reauthorization, after fine-tuning, with an increased funding level.

CONSTANCE E. CLAYTON
Superintendent, School District of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

INTRODUCTION

This commentary describes the experience of the School District of Philadelphia under the 1988 reauthorization and makes recommendations aimed at further strengthening both program flexibility and accountability for the success of the students most in need. It also outlines a vision for using Chapter 1 as a catalyst for the kind of large-scale restructuring of incentives and resources that is essential if the goals shared by all parties interested in the reauthorization of Chapter 1 legislation are to be realized. Our recommendations grow out of previous discussions in three areas—schoolwide projects, accountability, and restructuring—but they take our thinking a step further.

- **Schoolwide Projects.** Until recently, we had advocated lowering the eligibility cutoff to 65 percent. However, as we saw the eagerness of the Bush administration to lower, and perhaps eliminate, the eligibility requirement and consider it in the context of the Choice agenda, we had second thoughts. This concern is shared by Don Clark. As a result, this commentary recommends a new strategy: maintaining the 75 percent cutoff in most LEAs, but eliminating it in districts where the poverty mean is 65 percent or higher.
- **Program Involvement.** To encourage high goals without punishing urban schools, the commentary recommends a two-tiered process for program improvement—one involving all Chapter 1 schools (similar to our own School Improvement Planning Process) and one targeted for a limited cadre of schools making the least success. This approach maintains high expectations, but should make the number of schools "in program improvement" a nonissue.
- **Restructuring.** Within the context of saying that Chapter 1 cannot close the achievement gap single-handed, the commentary recommends positioning Chapter 1 funds as a catalyst for restructuring of both education funds and other health and social service funds.

RESTRUCTURING PHILADELPHIA'S CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

The 1988 reauthorization of Chapter 1 represented a major shift in the paradigm of how to most effectively deliver compensatory education services. Key to this paradigm shift were an emphasis on (1) success in the regular program and in the attainment of advanced skills, rather than on the provision of differentiated and supplementary remedial services; (2) flexibility in schools with a high concentration of poverty, to serve needy students by upgrading the entire educational program; and (3) accountability, focused at the school and student level, with provisions for a process of program improvement if progress was insufficient.

These changes in the federal law provided the framework for a major restructuring of the Chapter 1 program in the School District of Philadelphia, as indicated in the following table:

Table 1

School District Restructuring

	Pre-1988	Current
Underlying attitude	"Fix" the student	Improve the school
Basic strategy	Remediation	Prevention
Resource allocation	Spreading	Concentration
Program design	Differentiation	Alignment
	Reading, math	Expanded to social services
	Created centrally; same at each school	Created by schools through shared decisionmaking and school-based management
Evaluation	Program-centered	School- and child-centered
Program coordination	Fragmentation	School-based linkage supported by central initiatives

Central to the restructuring in Philadelphia has been our implementation of the legislative provision for schoolwide projects. Schools where 75 percent or more of the students come from families below the poverty line may be so designated; this designation requires them to create a plan to use their Chapter 1 resources to upgrade the overall school program. The school district has chosen to implement schoolwide projects by zero-basing the Chapter 1 allocations to these schools, thus setting the stage for a process of school-based management through shared decisionmaking.

Since 1988, the school district has expanded from 11 elementary schoolwide projects sites to 117 sites, including 5 senior high schools and 15 middle schools. In fall 1991, the Pennsylvania Department of Education determined that all 37 of the schoolwide projects sites completing their third year under the new federal accountability provisions had met the standards for continuation by increasing standardized test scores. The school district's expanded analysis indicated that these schools had also showed increased marks, reading levels, and attendance.

Perhaps most important, the school district analysis indicated that while the proportion of students in these schools eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children had *increased* from 62 percent to 71 percent during the previous three years, the proportion of students scoring low enough to qualify for Chapter 1 services had *decreased* from 68 percent to 60 percent in the same period.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 1993 REAUTHORIZATION

Schoolwide Projects

The original rationale for schoolwide projects was that in schools heavily impacted by poverty, needy students might best be helped to succeed in the regular program by upgrading the school as a whole, rather than by supplementary services. The school district, continuing to hold this viewpoint, advocates that most of the schoolwide project provisions should remain intact, particularly those mandating school-based planning, participatory decisionmaking, the school as the unit of change, and accountability based on progress of the neediest students.

In districts where the overall poverty level is not intense, the school district believes that the current cutoff of 75 percent poverty for schoolwide project status continues to be appropriate, because where the proportion of needy students is low, the use of Chapter 1 resources to upgrade the entire program is likely to result in dilution of services. However, in districts where the overall poverty level is high, we believe that the distinction between schools that qualify for schoolwide project status and those that do not may be arbitrary and can impede the most effective delivery of service.

- ***We suggest, therefore, that if a district's mean for poverty is at or above 65 percent, the district be given the option of designating all of its eligible schools for schoolwide projects.***

To permit districts to take full advantage of the opportunity for schoolwide projects would require three additional changes. First, the maintenance-of-effort provision for schoolwide project schools should be made consistent with the maintenance-of-effort and comparability provisions for Chapter 1 as a whole; without such a change, the cost of designating schoolwides may be prohibitive for many districts.

Second, for districts where the majority of the Chapter 1 schools are designated as schoolwides, there must be relief from the provision that every schoolwide project site must receive at least the average Chapter 1 per capita allocation for each eligible student. While this provision was clearly intended to provide extra support for the neediest schools, it has the opposite effect when most Chapter 1 sites are schoolwides, because it puts the school district in a position where it can no longer differentiate allocations based on relative poverty. Beyond that, the provision as it stands would eventually result in punishing successful schools as achievement increased and the number of eligible students decreased. *It is crucial that the Chapter 1 Program reward success rather than failure.*

The third issue in relation to schoolwide projects has to do with the provision that requires discontinuation of schoolwide project status for sites that do not meet the federal standards at the end of three years. We are very pleased that the federal provisions support our own emphasis on accountability and that the target group for Chapter 1 purposes is the neediest students.

We feel strongly, however, that immediate and automatic discontinuation is not the appropriate remedy for sites that do not meet continuation requirements. Immediate discontinuation is highly disruptive, since schools typically will not know their status earlier than a month before the opening of school. Moreover, automatic discontinuation assumes that the factors inhibiting achievement are rooted in the fact of the school being a schoolwide, rather than in any of a host of other possible factors.

We recommend that the schoolwide project accountability process be adapted to mirror that of Chapter 1 program improvement. Schools which have not shown enough growth after three years should become the focus of a planning and school-improvement process involving the state and the resources of regional laboratories. Removal of schoolwide status would still be one possibility, but only if the state determined that this was in the best interests of the students at the site.

Program Improvement

Chapter 1 is one of the few categorical aid programs with meaningful accountability provisions. The intent of these provisions—setting goals for success in the regular program, providing clear measures of progress, and building in processes for improvement when progress is insufficient—is at the heart of effective educational management, and it is our experience that the current program improvement requirements have been taken very seriously at the school and classroom levels.

However, the School District of Philadelphia, like other districts around the country, has also experienced significant problems with the implementation of the current provisions. Our first recommendation relates to the program-improvement *measures*, whose imperfections have become increasingly salient as the stakes of the evaluation have increased. Our primary concern regarding measures is that Chapter 1 evaluation is too reliant on standardized tests.

- ***Standardized test results should be used only for the purposes for which they are most effective—aggregation at the level of the district, state, and national program—and single-year data points should be prohibited as the basis of decisions regarding individual schools and students.***

Many other measures of success in the regular program, grade-level proficiency, and progress in basic and advanced skills are already available, and more would rapidly flower if the standardized test were weeded out.

We also have serious concerns about the program-improvement *process*. It has been set up in such a way that it is seen as a stigma, and therefore it creates an incentive for the lowering of goals. As firm believers in the importance of high expectations,

- ***We would like to see the federal legislation encourage high goals for success in the regular program, based on solid instructional indicators.***

We resonate to the recent statements of Mary Jean LeTendre, Director of Compensatory Education, U.S. Department of Education, that "Chapter 1 programs should be encouraged and possibly *mandated* to set actual deadlines for closing the achievement gap, for example, by the end of grade 6" and that "the explicit purpose of Chapter 1 now is to enable low-achieving students to catch up." We agree emphatically that the national educational goals cannot be met unless we find strategies for ensuring the success of Chapter 1 students.

However, much as we believe that closing the gap is both possible and essential, we must face everyday the realities of the unequal hand dealt to our children and to our schools. The RAND request for this commentary points out that "with federal assistance at approximately 6 percent of elementary and secondary education expenditures, Chapter 1 cannot possibly overcome the large financial advantages of schools in wealthy and middle-class neighborhoods." We need, then, a system of accountability which institutionalizes high expectations rather than low ones, and sets in place or reinforces meaningful processes for improving instruction, but does not "bash" or punish schools which are making significant progress despite enormous odds.

- ***To create improved accountability, the Philadelphia School District recommends a two-tiered system for program improvement.***

First, the school district endorses the concept of mandating goals for closing the gap for Chapter 1 students. We do so with the recognition that, at current resource levels, this will mean involving virtually all Chapter 1 schools in an ongoing process of program improvement as they seek to come as close as possible to achieving those goals. Based on our own eight years of experience with a systemwide school-improvement process, we see this as a highly constructive step.

Second, we support, in LeTendre's words, yet "tougher actions for low-performing schools that continue not to show progress." We would add to the above provisions for ongoing program improvement a requirement that each district designate annually a cadre of schools that have demonstrated the poorest performance/least improvement on the part of Chapter 1 students. The schools, selected by the district based on a pattern of two or three years of data, would cumulatively represent 10 to 20 percent of the total number of eligible schools in the district. Schoolwide projects which did not meet the criteria for continuation could be included in this group.

For this cadre of poorly performing schools, the legislation should mandate that the district collaborate with the state and the regional laboratories to plan and implement a three-year school-improvement strategy. The strategy, monitored by the state, would draw on the most effective instructional practices in use in schools with comparable demographics that are demonstrating success.

The above approach has several advantages over the current program improvement provisions. First, it institutionalizes the expectation that the goal of Chapter 1 is for the neediest students to catch up. Second, it provides for ongoing monitoring of progress and adaptation of strategies toward that end in all Chapter 1 schools, rather than targeting only a few schools which have failed to meet much lower standards. Third, for schools which show a pattern of failure over time, it provides for a long-term, intensive strategy, drawing on the resources of the regional laboratories and overseen by the state.

Restructuring: An Expanded Vision

This commentary began with a description of the restructuring of the Chapter 1 Program in Philadelphia—a degree of change that would have seemed an unrealistic dream ten years ago, but is now a reality. We close with a challenge to those interested in improving the life chances of Chapter 1 students—a challenge to greatly expand the vision of restructuring.

This expanded vision begins with legislation which would authorize districts to zero-base *all* categorical grants flowing into schools designated under Chapter 1 as schoolwide projects, providing the schools with a single block grant to be used to support the success of all students in the regular program. The grant would include dollars now separately targeted for Chapter 2, drug-free schools, vocational education, math/science education, and special education. The similarities among the goals of these programs, and the similarities of the populations they target, are much more striking than their differences.

Why, then, in an era of scarce education dollars, do we ensnare those at the school level in the tangled web of disparate regulations? If such a change is too radical to be made across the board, the School District of Philadelphia would welcome the opportunity to implement it on a pilot basis.

Expanding the vision yet another step, we urge those interested in the issues related to Chapter 1 reauthorization to recognize that the eventual realization of equity for Chapter 1 students will require a restructuring not just of educational resources, but also of the social and health services that are crucial to our students' educational progress and to their life chances. Could Chapter 1 build in matching incentive grants, making them available to cities willing to organize the zero-basing of local, city, state, and federal health and social service funds, and to manage these funds with the school at the hub? Why not?

LeTendre has said that "the success of disadvantaged children is the responsibility not just of Chapter 1, but of the entire school." We would go further, asserting that the success of our neediest children is the responsibility, the measure, and the hope of the entire community and society. If Chapter 1 not only rewarded success through its own funding structures, but also provided incentives for the coordination and restructuring of related educational and social service resources, we could move a long way toward making our dreams for our students become reality.

JOHN V. CORCORAN
Director, Chapter 1 Programs, Worcester Public Schools
Worcester, Massachusetts

> In the varied topography of professional practice, there is a high, hard ground that overlooks a swamp. On the high ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the use of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, problems are messy, confusing, and incapable of technical solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems of the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human concern (Schon in Sergiovanni and Moore, p. 195).

Federal policy supporting educational initiatives has engendered a number of programs that have historically been of significant and lasting benefit to low-income students. Perhaps the most successful of these programs has been the student loans granted under the Higher Education Act that has enabled many low-income students to complete their college education and to become productive members of our society.

Other federal policy, less successful, has resulted in a wide range of programs that while they supply much-needed resources to schools have also created a massive bureaucracy at the federal and state levels that has taken the authority and governance of schools away from the arena where it has historically been the most successful: the local school district, the individual school, and the teacher as practitioner.

This commentary focuses on one federal education program that shows promise in restoring the important role that local education agencies need to play if genuine educational reform is to occur in this country. It will also suggest that the teacher as practitioner and the individual school as the unit of change are the most significant areas that need to be supported if real and lasting change is to occur with respect to the education of students from low-income backgrounds.

Chapter 1 of the Education and Consolidation Act of 1982 as reauthorized in 1988 allows the use of funds in low-income areas to operate schoolwide projects which can be used for total school improvement. Regulations also state in Section 200.1(b)(1):

> The purpose of assistance under this part is to improve the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping these children . . . succeed in the regular program of the LEA; attain grade level proficiency and improve achievement in basic and more advanced skills (Federal Register, Vol. 54, N. 96, p. 21757).

Implicit in these regulations is an assertion that the deficit model of education is not to be encouraged in developing programs under this act. Educationally deprived students need to succeed in classes with their peers, work at grade level, and be included in programs that stress higher-order thinking skills, as well as basic skills. I believe that the schoolwide-project model offers the best example of an arena where the explicit purpose of the act, as stated in the regulations, and the reality of school practice can coalesce.

Donald Schon writes about the classroom as "an indeterminate, swampy zone of practice," where teachers daily confront their profession. He describes this world in much the same way that Ann Lieberman does when she talks about the "dailiness of teaching." It is in this real world of the school and the classroom that students from low-income backgrounds come to experience school.

The ability to change practice—to alter it and ultimately to improve it—thus depends on individual schools and individual teachers. It is an "act in progress" that gradually adapts itself to the changing demographics of our times. Michael Fullan describes change as a process, not an event, and it is this process that continuously molds itself to the changing needs of the local school.

The schoolwide-project model allows this process to occur without all the baggage of bureaucracy that accompanies federal legislation. It allows, indeed encourages, administrators and teachers to make changes, to experiment, to take risks, to subvert the dominant paradigm, and more important, to focus on all of the children in the school.

Critics of schoolwide projects have said that it may divert funds from "the most needy students," or that funds may be used simply to replace locally funded teachers, particularly in these difficult economic times. While there is some truth to these concerns, these critics offer status quo solutions for our changing schools. What is needed now in this current plethora of education bashing is the willingness to explore new alternatives and to focus on those aspects of schools which can assist the process of providing better educational opportunities for low-income students.

Those aspects, as noted above, are the individual school and the teacher as practitioner. Our experience for the last five years operating Chapter 1 schools using this model has revealed both a wealth of positive qualitative information indicating the success of this model and enough quantitative data to satisfy the requirements of the law.

We have, however, only just begun to develop these models, and there has been and will continue to be midcourse corrections, fine-tuning, and in the case of one of our schools a dramatic shift as we continue this process. The journey thus far has been an exciting and revealing one and those of us involved in this expedition have learned that this new flexibility in the legislation offers real hope for change in the education of low-income students.

All of our schools have begun to try new things. Unfettered by rules and regulations, school staffs have explored a variety of alternative service-delivery models primarily intended to address the importance of reducing the fragmentation of the child's day and to provide better coordination of program activities among all building personnel. The focus is to improve learning for all students.

Richard Allington (1983) maintains that "the second system," as he describes services such as Chapter 1 and special education programs, results in substantial loss of instructional time, lack of ownership and responsibility for instruction, and often different and contradictory methodological approaches for students. Our schools have experimented with in-class instruction, flexible grouping, continuous regrouping, and reduced pupil-teacher ratios, to name a few of the many approaches available to provide more coordination of program activities.

While some of our schools have begun to develop a vision and to work on the culture of the school using a macro approach to reform, others are still mired in the never-ending variety of new programs that are available for schools. Programs such as HOTS, Reading Recovery, Assertive Discipline, and approaches such as whole language, thematic instruction, and cooperative learning are used in our schoolwide projects.

We have encouraged our schools to adopt preventive rather than remedial models of instruction, while at the same time recognizing that many students can benefit from remedial programs that contain high-quality instruction and close coordination with the student's regular program. Early childhood programs, full-day kindergartens, and Reading Recovery are examples of preventive models that offer real promise of success. Flexible grouping, cooperative learning and the HOTS Program are examples of programs and approaches that combine high-quality instruction with close coordination.

The Even Start Family Literacy Program is another example of a potentially powerful preventive model. However, funding is inadequate at this time to have much of a real impact except in a few communities. There is also a danger that programs developed under this section will continue to follow what has been called the "Transmission of School Practices Model" and to place the blame on the home for a lack of adequate literacy practices.

Funds have been made available for ongoing and continuous staff development activities at all schoolwide project schools. As in the area of school autonomy, there still remains a considerable degree of variability in individual school use of and access to these funds.

One school has adopted a staff development model and is using ideas from research on adult learning and "growth states inventories" (Joyce and Showers) to assess staff needs. Other schools are using these funds to provide training in specific programmatic areas, such as cooperative learning, thematic instruction, and the writing process. Still others are providing moneys for staff to visit other schools, to attend conferences and workshops, or simply to allow staff time from their regular classroom responsibilities to collaborate and plan with their peers.

The ability of all staff at the schoolwide projects to participate in staff-development activities has been a positive aspect in all of our schoolwide projects. An underlying theme that runs through many of these staff-development activities is that teachers and administrators who work with low-income children need to believe that these children can learn, and that expectations need to be raised for all children. One of our schools has as its focus an accelerated learning model based on Henry Levin's Accelerated Schools approach. Another school has planned to work closely with various parent and community groups to share the strengths and celebrate the strong ethnic nature of their area of the city.

Impediments to real reform and change in schools exist at the school district level, in individual schools, and in the practice of teachers as they go about their daily tasks. Federal policy can provide resources and little else to remove these impediments. Recent demonstrations in Los Angeles stand as dramatic testimony to the failure of the federal government to solve problems in the area of civil and human rights at the local level.

People's attitudes and beliefs are not going to change by the passing of a law in Washington or the making of another rule or regulation on Capitol Hill during the Chapter 1 reauthorization process. Federal policy would be better advised to encourage and support local initiatives and innovations, rather than to micromanage local efforts through regulation.

Kenneth Sirotnik (in Sergiovanni and Moore, p. 109) describes the school as the center of change:

> The school is the obvious place where educators can come together to deal with tough issues and good ideas in the context of practice. The school is the place where critical inquiry is not just an armchair dialectic, but a paradigm of knowing and re-knowing in the context of action. Schools are not only places for teaching critical thinking; they are also places for thinking critically about teaching.

It is in the daily practice of teaching at the local school level that real and substantive change will occur for low-income students. Schoolwide projects offer the best hope for these students because school personnel are able to operate programs that can provide ongoing staff development for all teachers, self-renewal for the individual school, and a place where teachers and administrators can think critically about teaching.

RAMON C. CORTINES
Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco Unified School District
San Francisco, California

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCLUSION IN CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

Dropout Prevention

At the high-school level, dropout rates for low-income students are high. Chapter 1 programs should see to the needs of this population. Professional development for teachers ought to focus on community and family influences which direct the students' attention away from the school. Schools must compete against these influences. Curriculum and instructional methods must draw students in, using creative approaches.

Chapter 1 funds can be made available for Chapter 1 secondary schools where 75 percent or more of the teachers are willing to participate in curriculum reform and staff training in order to turn around dropout rates, absenteeism, and suspensions. Incentives can be provided for improving the percentage of students who graduate and the percentage who go on to college and remain there.

Summer School

The days of the traditional family and "summer days at the lake" are declining. More and more urban families have fallen into poverty or low-income status and are headed by a single parent. We must have summer programs that integrate learning with discovery and application and, at the same time, provide daily activity for children. These cannot be programs that merely reinforce the drill and practice of skill learning; they must encourage creativity and a desire to explore and learn. Magnet school programs are an example.

Programs for older children need to include classroom learning and job or skill development. The latter could include salary or stipend payments for services performed or vocational training in addition to the core curriculum to prepare students for the job market.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING REAUTHORIZATION OF CHAPTER 1

Selection of Eligible Schools

Section 200.30(b)(2)(i) states that under certain conditions an "LEA may designate as eligible any school attendance area in which at least 25 percent of the children are from low-income families."

- ***Recommendation: Change 25 percent to 15 percent for districts that have implemented desegregation programs.***

The desegregation process tends to distribute low-income students throughout the district on a more even basis. Consequently, far fewer schools have 25 percent low-income under a desegregated system. The regulations already consider school districts that have 15 percent low-income as eligible for concentration grants. This recommendation would apply the 15 percent concept to the individual school site.

Schoolwide Projects

Section 200.36 states that if "at least 75 percent of the children residing in the school-attendance area or enrolled in the school are from low-income families: then the school may be designated as a schoolwide project and all students may be served with Chapter 1 funds."

- ***Recommendation: Change the criterion for schoolwide projects from 75 percent low-income in an attendance area or school to 75 percent educationally disadvantaged for those districts implementing a desegregation plan.***

Chapter 1 regulations indicate that after a school is determined eligible based on low-income criteria those students that are identified as educationally disadvantaged are to be served with Chapter 1 funds. In a desegregated school district there is a tendency for students to be more evenly distributed throughout the district. However, many Chapter 1-eligible schools with high concentrations of low-income students (though not 75 percent) do have over 75 percent educationally disadvantaged being served with Chapter 1 funds. These schools (with less than 75 percent low income but over 75 percent eligible students) should be allowed to implement schoolwide Chapter 1 projects.

Continuation of Services

Section 200.30(b)(5)(i) states that "an LEA may continue to provide for one year Chapter 1 services in a school-attendance area that is not eligible . . . if that school-attendance area was eligible and selected under the standards . . . in the immediately preceding year."

- ***Recommendation: Change "for one year" to "for two years."***

Section 200.31(c)(3) allows districts to continue to serve, for a maximum of two additional years, a student who is no longer eligible. Moreover, previous regulations allowed for serving schools for up to two years after they were no longer eligible. Schools need two years after becoming ineligible to adjust to the educational impact of the loss of Chapter 1 funds.

Identification of Limited English Proficient

An LEA may identify limited-English-proficient students as Chapter 1 if these children have needs stemming from educational deprivation and not needs related solely to their limited English proficiency [Section 200.31(c)(5i)(A)].

- ***Recommendation. Identify all limited-English-proficient children as Chapter 1 in order to provide as much support as possible yet not supplant services required by federal, state, and local law to overcome the limited English proficiency.***

Immigrant children enter this country at the poverty level and are in need of as much support as possible to make them productive citizens. Many immigrants come from language groups where standardized tests are unavailable. Assessment procedures are difficult to implement in a consistent manner without standardized tests or similar criteria for all language groups. If all limited-English enrollees are identified as Chapter 1 upon enrollment, those with higher skills will soon exit from the program and those with lesser skills will continue to receive necessary services.

Program Improvement

An LEA is expected to identify as a program-improvement school one that "shows no improvement or a decline in aggregate performance of participating children for a 12-month period."

- ***Recommendation: Change a "12-month period" to "24-month period" or "two out of three years."***

In several identified schools in our district, test scores have dropped during a single year and risen the following year and continued upward in the year thereafter. The first year increases came at the end of a planning year and therefore had not resulted from the direct efforts of program improvement. However, in accord with SEA guidelines the school remained in program improvement despite the improvement in performance. If schools are identified not by a single year's drop in scores, but by consecutive years or two out of three years of nonachievement, then the program would have more impact.

By Chapter 1 regulations, all a school is required to have is a year with positive gains to be dropped from program improvement. Likewise, these gains should be maintained for at least two years before dropping from program improvement. These two recommendations would prevent schools from dropping in and out of program improvement.

RICHARD A. DENOYER

Superintendent, Princeton City Schools
Cincinnati, Ohio

The Princeton District has tried, over the years, to find the most instructionally effective way to use Chapter 1 funds for the benefit of our students. We have looked at pre- and posttest data; grades; student, teacher, and parent perceptions of the program; and long-term academic effects of the program. Some of our earlier research indicated that Chapter 1 students in grades 4-12 did no better in reading achievement than like students in the regular reading classes. We did observe that students in the control group felt better about staying in the regular class.

Further, we found that students in grades 1, 2, and 3 did significantly better in reading achievement than like students in regular reading classes. We tried to make changes in the programs beyond third grade but kept getting the same results. We decided to use the Chapter 1 moneys on several different programs that we believed would produce better results. We implemented two new programs, Chapter 1 preschool and all-day kindergarten.

We observed that the students who participated in these early childhood education programs did significantly better than past students who didn't have access to these programs in our Chapter 1-eligible schools. The first and second graders did significantly better than past first and second graders in these schools. They also gained more than one year in reading achievement. This is significant when you consider that 80 percent of the children in our Chapter 1 schools are socioeconomically deprived. We are not satisfied with these results, since we know that these children come to kindergarten between two and three years behind the other students of the district.

In addition to Chapter 1 preschool, all-day kindergarten, and the reading program for eligible Chapter 1 students, we have implemented and encouraged the following:

- Home/school program. A teacher and two aides visit all the parents of students in our Lincoln Heights Elementary School attendance area to suggest ways in which parents can help their children do better in school, including creating study areas in the home, establishing quiet time for study, checking homework, playing family games, getting involved at school, and attending conferences and programs available for parents.
- Learning disability tutors.
- Parent volunteer program.
- Business partnerships.
- After-school and Saturday school programs for at-risk students.
- After-school enrichment programs.
- Free summer school for students scoring in stanines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on standard achievement tests.

- Mathematics computer laboratory.
- Small class size: 19 students per teacher.
- Full-time psychologist.
- Montessori kindergarten.
- Kindergarten class size: average of 15 students per teacher.
- Drug abuse resistance education (DARE).
- Staff: 97 percent yearly attendance.
- Students: 96 percent yearly attendance.
- Ongoing staff development programs.
- Interagency collaborative of social (Department of Human Services) and educational services to assist socioeconomically deprived families. The collaborative will also work with ten families as a part of a pilot program to make them self-sufficient by developing their strengths and their independence.
- Parents-as-teachers program for parents of children from birth to three years old. The program works with human services agencies to give parents and children a better chance to compete with the other adults and children of our district.

I have listed some of the programs that we have developed to help students in our Chapter 1-eligible schools and described some of our successes to demonstrate that even with all these programs in place, together with a caring, knowledgeable, and effective staff, we are still not getting the growth from these students that they need in order to successfully compete with the middle- and upper-class students of our district.

We need to find a diplomatic way to help adults work more effectively with their children and to better educate themselves in order to qualify for more productive employment. We need better health services and adult education programs; we also need industries that will take adults without the necessary skills and motivation for employment and help to train and develop them into productive members of the workplace and society.

If we want to change the present trend of our welfare state and socioeconomically deprived people, we have to change the adults. Just working with the children, when we know they are going home to situations that don't give them much hope, is *almost* a losing battle. We have to help the adults as well as their children if we are to break the bonds that restrict poor people from sharing the American dream.

I believe that Chapter 1 and other federal moneys should be spent to improve the education of the adults and children of our socioeconomically deprived communities. I further believe that enterprise zones should be approved only for deprived areas if we want to improve the conditions of our poor people and their children. The growing number of socioeconomically deprived people presents a crisis that is drastically affecting the economy and our society. We'd better find ways of improving living conditions for all poor people, if not for charitable reasons, then for the hope of living in a peaceful society.

JOSEPH A. FERNANDEZ
Chancellor, New York City Public Schools
Brooklyn, New York

INTRODUCTION

As one of the largest recipients of Chapter 1 funds in the nation, the New York City Public Schools maintain that any changes in the Chapter 1 legislation should:

- Target funds to schols with very high concentrations of poverty
- Provide as much flexibility as possible in service-delivery models
- Ensure that the integrity of Chapter 1 programs and services is maintained.

In the sections that follow, we address the major issues raised by RAND, which fall into two broad categories: resources and local services. We conclude with additional concerns that we feel should be addressed in the upcoming reauthorization discussions.

RESOURCES: CHANGE THE EXISTING FORMULA

We strongly support the provision in the Chapter 1 legislation that concentration grants be targeted to high-poverty districts. We do not believe, however, that the current formula achieves this goal. Sixty-five percent of all local educational agencies (LEAs) now receive concentration funds, diluting the resources available for schools with very high poverty concentrations. We support the following changes in the existing allocation formula to better achieve program goals.

- First, decennial census data do not adequately indicate the relative poverty among geographical areas of the country. While we understand the technical difficulties involved in obtaining a more timely account of children in poverty, we support the use of poverty indicators that can be updated annually. Second, any measure used must reflect regional cost-of-living differences which define poverty in one area differently than in other areas. Third, there should also be an accommodation for the well-documented poverty undercount in the 1990 census. This is particularly important in New York City, since 15,000-20,000 new immigrants enroll in our schools each year.
- The use of average daily atendance undercounts long-term absentees. We believe it is more appropriate to use average daily enrollment than average daily attendance numbers, since we must organize our classes and be prepared to serve all enrolled students.
- We believe that a change in the way funds are currently allocated to LEAs would improve targeting of funds to schools with high concentrations of poverty. Some possibilities to consider include:
  - Allocate some funds directly to states, and suballocate funds only to schools above a statewide average poverty rate.

- Create a school-based funding stream to replace concentration grants for schools with the highest poverty concentrations.
- Require local funding of remedial programs for poor children up to a specified percentage of the school-age population. Chapter 1 funds then would be allocated only for the number of students above this threshold.
- Redefine eligibility criteria for the Migrant Education Program to include homeless children. These children have the same problems and needs as children of migrant workers—their education is fragmented and beyond the capacity of the school to address.

LOCAL SERVICES

Serve All Needy Students

Chapter 1 funds should continue to supplement the regular instructional program. In maintaining the emphasis on supplemental services, we can ensure that local effort is maintained and that Chapter 1 funds are not used for supplanting services previously provided with local or state dollars. However, in high-poverty-concentration schools that are not schoolwide projects, all students should be eligible for service. Research has shown that in schools with higher than 50 percent poverty, achievement for all students suffers. The LEAs should continue to be required to demonstrate that services paid for with Chapter 1 funds supplement services regularly provided with state and local funds.

Facilitate Schoolwide Improvement Through Schoolwide Projects

The New York City Public Schools are one of the largest implementors of schoolwide projects nationwide and one of that program's strongest supporters. Schoolwide projects allow schools to focus on the regular instructional program, which is our ultimate educational goal; promote integration rather than fragmentation of services; and eliminate the labeling of participants.

To ensure that Chapter 1 schoolwide project schools address the special needs of Chapter 1-eligible students, in New York City we require that schools opting for schoolwide improvement status submit a detailed plan for addressing the needs of educationally disadvantaged students. To ensure active participation of parents and staff in the design, implementation, and evaluation of schoolwide projects, participation in schoolwide projects is voluntary and requires a commitment to school-based management/shared decisionmaking.

We have three recommendations for strengthening the schoolwide improvement provision in the Chapter 1 reauthorization:

- First, all high-poverty schools should be eligible for schoolwide projects. This can be achieved by changing the threshold for schoolwide project eligibility in one of two ways:

  - Lower the threshold for eligibility from 75 percent poverty to 50 percent poverty, since research indicates that overall student performance declines when over half of the students in a school are poor.
  - Alternatively, all schools in the first quartile of schools ranked nationally or statewide by concentration of poverty should qualify for schoolwide projects. Schools in the second quartile could be designated as eligible by the state education agency (SEA).

- Second, explicitly allow eligible schools to use Chapter 1 funds for the planning of schoolwide projects. This would provide for a period of planning to prepare all constituencies for changes and improvements in the school's educational program and would greatly facilitate the successful implementation of their schoolwide project plans. We also suggest that schools that engage in the schoolwide planning process remain eligible the following year regardless of their index of poverty. This would ensure that those schools that have devoted the time and energy to planning will have the opportunity to put their plan into action.
- Third, bring the schoolwide projects maintenance-of-effort provision into line with the general maintenance-of-effort requirement, i.e., not less than 90 percent of local and state expenditures for the previous year. Districts should be allowed to apply to the state education agency (SEA) for a one-time waiver from this requirement on two conditions: that local effort has been reduced in *all* schools in the LEA and that the reduction of local effort in a schoolwide project is not greater than the reduction of local effort in any school in the LEA. This would make allowances for across-the-board cuts in local funding that have occurred nationwide.

Increase the Emphasis on Comprehensive Family-Centered Services

We believe that the Chapter 1 program should be used to support comprehensive services, such as that of the Head Start model of early childhood education, which incorporates education, social service, health and nutrition, and parent involvement. While the legislation specifically authorizes pupil personnel services, it does not explicitly authorize health and nutrition services. We recommend that the federal legislation expand the definition of allowable expenditures to include health services and nutrition personnel, including health aides. Health and nutrition services, like pupil personnel services, enhance the ability of children to learn and benefit from Chapter 1 services.

OTHER CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM ISSUES

Innovation Projects

The New York City Public Schools strongly support the provision for innovative projects in the Chapter 1 legislation. We believe, however, that the current options are not flexible enough to encourage real innovation.

One option would be to enable schools that show substantial progress in the Chapter 1 program to expand the use of Chapter 1 funds to provide enrichment in any curriculum area or school-related activities for heterogeneous groups, including both Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 children. For Chapter 1 participants to truly succeed in the regular school program they need:

- Exposure to a wide range of experiences to broaden the background knowledge they bring to instruction in basic and more-advanced skills
- Interdisciplinary instruction that helps students apply basic and more-advanced skills to solving complex, cross-disciplinary problems.

This flexibility will encourage schools to move from skill-centered remediation to the enrichment-based models that many experts believe are more effective for Chapter 1 students.

As a second option, we recommend that parent-involvement programs be extended to include parents of all students as long as the quality of services to parents of participating students is not diminished. Activities that include a heterogeneous mix of Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 parents promote a richer learning environment for parents and reduce the isolation that many Chapter 1 parents may feel.

Program Assessment

As proposed above, all students in high-poverty schools would be eligible to receive services, regardless of whether they are in a schoolwide project school. New accountability measures must ensure that the school as a whole improves, that the lowest achieving quartile of students in the school improves, and that success will not result in a loss of funds. New provisions for all high-poverty schools should:

- Define academic success based on local and state standards for excellence in the academic program and in English-language competency
- Require a comprehensive building-level needs assessment
- Allow for more flexible measures of achievement.

Standardized, norm-referenced data should be collected only for a sample of students on a biennial basis as a measure of overall program success. States should be encouraged to develop alternative assessment procedures to ensure school accountability. Schools should be encouraged to monitor data on individual children that truly reflect their school performance and provide teachers and administrators with an assessment of strengths and needs for particpating students.

For all Chapter 1 schools, when measures indicate that a school is not succeeding,

- Selection criteria for required participation in program improvement must be broadened and based on better measures of student progress.
- The corrective action of placing a school under program improvement should be part of a comprehensive review and improvement plan for the entire school.

Finally, schools must not be penalized for succeeding. The problems facing poor children in poor schools usually return once funding is reduced. Current law requires local school districts to apportion Chapter 1 funds to schools based solely on educational needs. If funding eligibility for participation were based on poverty, not exclusively on educational achievement, successful schools could continue to be funded and build on their accomplishments to seek excellence, rather than settle for minimum standards.

Extending Services to Eligible Nonparticipants

We support the proposed change in Chapter 1 regulations to permit the incidental inclusion of non-Chapter 1 students in Chapter 1 programs as long as this does not diminish the services being provided to Chapter 1 participants.

Extending Chapter 1 Eligibility to Bilingual Students

Under current regulations, bilingual students are eligible to participate in Chapter 1 programs only if their educational disadvantage is not related to their limited-English-proficient (LEP) status. We are suggesting that by virtue of their LEP status, these students should qualify as educationally disadvantaged because their limited English proficiency precludes their full participation in the regular curriculum.

STANLEY J. HERMAN
Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Program Management
Pittsburgh Public Schools
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

CHAPTER 1 MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

I have been the senior administrator of Chapter 1 in the Pittsburgh Public Schools for the last 12 years. Coordinating services while meeting narrow state interpretation of federal guidelines has been a major problem. At times the district was restricted to a $75 per day consultant fee without prior clearance in Harrisburg. In other years, a computer-generated individual student CAI time sheet had to be rewritten by hand to accommodate state-required time-share logs. Programs which were receiving exemplary Chapter 1 recognition in other states were prohibited in Pennsylvania.

Things have gotten better over the years, but I still believe that individual districts are constrained by state guidelines, which are driven by a need for smooth management rather than program flexibility. If only the Department of Defense were as regulated as Chapter 1.

The same case can be made for the eligibility requirements for Chapter 1 students. When all is said and done, the standardized tests are the gatekeepers. This continues in spite of overwhelming data that standardized tests do not measure what students need to learn and demonstrate. The multimillion dollar testing industry exists because it is the most expedient way to spread students along a continuum.

The Pittsburgh School District has had marvelous success with performance-based assessment, but the California Achievement Tests drive instruction because the test scores are the "coin of the realm." Congress must understand that what is tested is what is valued. What we must do is find ways to determine what learning has value and find ways to assess it. Existing standardized tests do not do it.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING CHAPTER 1 SERVICES

I am intrigued by your letter, which suggests that Chapter 1 dollars, or part of them, would be used as a match for leveraging state dollars. The concept would certainly help states to find the courage to fund local school districts in a more equitable fashion than most existing formulas.

Merging Chapter 1 funds with other categorical funds is also an approach which makes sense. In many districts, my own included, unjust accountability weight of standardized tests forces youngsters to be labeled as special education. The special education budget is a runaway train which threatens many districts with bankruptcy.

In one of our schools we operate a "rights-without-labels" approach, which provides needed services for children without labeling them as Chapter 1, learning disabled, mentally retarded, attention deficit disorder, or just unmotivated. Resources are provided by a combination of local, Chapter 1, and special education funds.

Children are happy and learning. Yet, I fear an audit exception from state or federal bean counters who may not be able to track a dollar.

Your suggestion that Chapter 1 dollars be used for integrated family services is very encouraging. In 1985, our district discontinued providing evening computer-assisted tutorials and GED training for Chapter 1 parents because we were cited for providing more computer time to non-Chapter 1 students than our prorated Chapter 1 cost would allow. Our claim that the computers were being used with Chapter 1 parents at a time when students were not in school was rejected.

One of the best cases for spending Chapter 1 funds on nontraditional services is made by a Chapter 1 parent herself:

> One of the most important aspects of Chapter 1 is the mandated parental involvement component. However, with so many American families in a socioeconomic crisis, a parent's utmost priority is basic survival. Before we can motivate many parents to be active in their child's education, we must first assist them in satisfying their immediate needs.

The immediate needs in many poor communities are food, shelter, and clothing. Education becomes insigificant when families are hungry and homeless. Unfortunately in our society today, education is overshadowed by illiteracy, drugs, and violence, all of which contribute to the destruction of the family unit. A parent who cannot read and/or has had negative school experiences generally will not be active in her child's school. A parent who lives with physical violence and/or drug abuse finds it difficult to devote her energy to parental involvement in school when her life or her child's life may be in danger.

Extending Chapter 1 funds to impact the total family can better serve Chapter 1 students. This has been evidenced by the increasing numbers of Chapter 1 parent resource centers that are being established nationwide. These centers provide support, nurturing, and education for parents to enable them to foster the academic success of the student. The Pittsburgh Public School Chapter 1 District-wide Parent Advisory Council has witnessed such a need, and we are presently in the process of implementing a Chapter 1 parent center in our area. Since this need exists in most areas, school districts should be encouraged to use Chapter 1 funds for this purpose.

E. RAY HOLT

Superintendent, Memphis City Schools
Memphis, Tennessee

The Memphis City School system would like to present the following concerns and suggestions in anticipation of the reauthorization of Chapter 1 by Congress in 1993.

COORDINATION BETWEEN LOCAL, STATE, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PERSONNEL

- Require more training for state personnel to facilitate more efficient communication with LEAs.
- LEAs should receive consistent interpretations and information regarding Chapter 1 guidelines from personnel with the state department of education and the technical assistance centers (TACs). Mechanisms are needed to align the interpretations given by state and TAC agents.
- Communications between LEAs, state personnel, and TAC personnel should be made in writing rather than just verbally.

TIME FRAMES

- The period for reauthorization should be extended to allow full implementation of federal regulations. Approximately three to five years are required to implement an innovation.
- Time frames outlined in legislation are inconsistent with the realities of a spring-to-spring or fall-to-fall evaluation cycle. Student outcomes based on standardized test scores are available too late to allow a school to adequately plan for program improvement or program change due to the loss of schoolwide project status.

DESIRED OUTCOMES

- Desired outcomes should carry as much weight as NCE differences in determining whether student progress has been achieved.
- Regulations should contain specifics regarding desired outcomes, such as the number of desired outcomes needed to override the lack of the required NCE differences and the topics of the desired outcomes. For example, if a school does not achieve the program objective based on NCE gains and program improvement is triggered, would the attainment of two of four desired outcomes (one of which concerned achievement) outweigh the lack of NCE gains?

LEA PERSONNEL

- Given the reduction of state and local resources, how can we best use Chapter 1 professional staff for the benefit of teaching and learning?
- The regulations should provide a specific definition of *supplant.*

ANNUAL REVIEW, PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

- The federal guidelines should provide examples of the minimum and maximum acceptable processes required for implementation of annual review, school program improvement, and student program improvement. Specifics regarding how accountability should be determined should be provided. Descriptions of exceptionally well-designed procedures would also be helpful.
- Regarding three-year accountability for schoolwide project schools, the lack of comparability between schools using the "other schools" comparison should be addressed. The regulations should address the lack of comparability between schools that qualify for SWP with a 75 percent poverty index and Chapter 1 schools with lower indexes.
- Student mobility is a variable to be considered in planning successful programs. In addition, high student-mobility rates cause tracking of students for student program improvement to be a burdensome task for large urban systems.
- Another concern is the "same-school" and "other-schools" comparison required in the third-year accountability of schoolwide project schools. First, same-school comparisons are based on data that are at least six years old. Over a period of six years, many programmatic changes (related or not related to Chapter 1) may have occurred.

EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

- ***In the short time since reauthorization, many school districts have acquired computer-based instructional learning systems (ILSs) for their Chapter 1 schools. Installation of these systems has required teacher training, wiring of buildings, and restructuring of the school day. A small group of schools in which ILSs have been installed are expected to lose their Chapter 1 eligibility based on the most recent calculation of the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunches. What is the disposition of this equipment?***

We appreciate this opportunity for sharing these concerns. We hope your study will influence the development of alternative options and strategies for improving program operations.

PAUL D. HOUSTON

Superintendent, Riverside Unified School District
Riverside, California

This reauthorization of Chapter 1 in 1993 is an important event as we look at the students who benefit from compensatory education services and, indeed, how the program influences the reform efforts undertaken by all entities in public education.

SHORTCOMINGS IN THE CURRENT CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

Chapter 1 Formula. The legislation needs to improve the accuracy and timeliness of census data used in all federal education formulas. It is very detrimental to California and other states with a fast-growing population of young, disadvantaged people to base Chapter 1 funding on data more than 12 years old. The use of 1980 census data for the 1992-1993 allocation is costing California $134 million.

Insufficient Funds. Our district is unable to serve seven eligible schools because we lack the funds. Chapter 1 funding must be increased to keep pace with the needs of our population. The language contained in P.L. 100-297 regarding authorized funding should be followed by the Appropriations Committee, namely,

> Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to . . . expand the program authorized by this chapter over the next five years by increasing funding for this chapter of at least $500,000,000 over baseline each fiscal year and thereby increasing the percentage of eligible children served in each fiscal year with the intent of serving all eligible children by fiscal year 1993.

(The 1992 appropriation is the first to reach this goal set forth in 1988, but the allocations are based on an outdated formula which benefits states with declining populations and penalizes states with growing populations.)

Schoolwide Maintenance-of-Effort Requirement. Currently, schoolwide project schools must maintain per child spending at such schools at the 100 percent level instead of the 90 percent level required for traditional Chapter 1 schools. This is a hardship for states undergoing severe state education-funding reductions, and potentially halts the implementation of effective schoolwide programs in those schools most in need. (Schoolwide schools must have 75 percent or more poverty.)

Program Improvement Inconsistencies. We all agree that we should be accountable for increased learning by students served by Chapter 1, but the program improvement requirements are being interpreted by 50 different states in 50 different manners. State agencies are not held accountable by the U.S. Department of Education.

The almost exclusive use of norm-referenced testing in evaluating the Chapter 1 program causes some programs to be directed toward the attainment of basic skills, with less attention to higher-order thinking skills and problem solving. Though the current legislation does not require NRT results for identification, far too many districts still use them as their only criterion for enrolling children in Chapter 1.

Chapter 1 Strengths

- The current requirements for targeting schools and students enhance the probability that children served by the Chapter 1 program are those intended by the statute.
- The modified purpose for Chapter 1, "to assist identified children to be successful in the regular program and to increase achievement in both basic and advanced skills," gave districts and schools (1) the flexibility to improve the global program for students by allowing for increased staff-development opportunities and (2) the increased participation of classroom teachers.
- Negotiated rule making allows for practitioners to have some influence in shaping the regulations at the federal level. The committees of practitioners, at the state level, make state agencies more accountable to those who really have the knowledge and expertise—the educators at the local level.
- The ability to use up to 5 percent of the Chapter 1 funds for innovation gives districts and schools the impetus to try innovative practices and to include more classroom teachers in the responsibility of educating disadvantaged youngsters.

Other policies and practices that have strengthened Chapter 1 program efforts are not necessarily included in the current legislation. One example is the increased coordination between the U.S. Department of Education and the Department of Human Resources, which oversees Head Start programs. The outcome has been encouragement to articulate the purposes and activities of both Chapter 1 and Head Start, thereby increasing parent involvement and offering more services to the family unit.

REALISTIC OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The focus on low-income students and families must be maintained. Family service and preschool should be specifically included in reauthorization language so as to really impact, in a positive way, the future of disadvantaged children.

Formula. This reauthorization will be the first time since 1972 that it has coincided with the release of new census data. The Chapter 1 formula should be analyzed and specific changes made to fairly allocate funds to states according to their actual need. We support the use of annually updated census data, including poverty data for Chapter 1 and other programs which use the Chapter 1 formula.

Funding. We must not be timid in asking Congress to use the peace dividend to support one of the most needed and successful educational programs in the nation. Chapter 1 gains are good; they could be better for more students if districts had sufficient funding.

Maintenance of Effort and Schoolwide Projects. The provision demanding 100 percent maintenance of effort must be dropped from legislative language.

Also, the level of poverty (currently at 75 percent) should be allowed at the K-3 level even in a K-6 school. The direst poverty is reflected with our very young pupils. This would enable more schools to deliver such programs as Dr. Robert Slavin's "Success for All," which guarantees reading success by the third grade. The percentage should be changed from 75 to 65 to allow more schools to participate in schoolwide. There is not a great deal of difference between schools with 65 percent poverty and 75 percent. We do not recommend, however, that the percentage drop any lower. Schools with lower percentages more closely resemble the average population with many fewer children participating in programs.

Program Improvement. There needs to be consistency between the measures and time spans for entry into and exit from the status of program improvement. "Local conditions" need to be more clearly stated in terms of what districts can or cannot do about these conditions. Currently, SEAs are free to interpret them according to their own criteria; thus, there is no consistency across the country regarding programs that are succeeding or those that are failing.

Testing. While we understand the need for aggregatable data for program-improvement purposes, it is suggested that sampling be allowed. At the same time, more authentic types of assessment should be encouraged to measure the needs for program modification, as well as the provisions of better measures for children's thinking and reasoning abilities.

TED D. KIMBROUGH

General Superintendent of Schools, Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

The Chicago Public School system, like many other school districts in the country, appreciates the involvement of the federal government in its efforts to educate hundreds of students. Students' abilities to learn may be hampered by a variety of impediments, including those impoverished home environments that fail to adequately prepare children for schooling, or language barriers that generate miscommunications between the home and the school and between the student and the teacher. Frequently, state and local resources are insufficient to meet the multiplicity of needs that characterize many of the students; therefore, ESEA Chapter 1 funding becomes critical in filling the gap created by shortages in the local and state revenues.

The categorical nature of the Chapter 1 program is a strength in itself. Without the requirement that restricts the use of ESEA funds for any purpose except for supplementary academic programs for the needy students, school districts might succumb to the temptation to take care of other needs first, while those of the low achiever are placed on the back burner. We recommend that this provision in the law be continued in the forthcoming reauthorization act.

We also recommend that the provision for accountability for program improvement be retained. Some modifications need to be made, however, including:

- Dropping the requirement for school-generated desired outcomes in favor of more traditional measures, since the former frequently lacks valid and reliable measurement devices, and the latter are easy to handle with known instruments
- Changing the definition for sustained effects to include only the students who successfully leave the Chapter 1 program and those who require multiple years of service
- Incorporating, in the law or policy manual, incentives for rewarding schools that faithfully adhere to program-improvement requirements, as well as measures for dealing with schools that place a low priority on the program-improvement provision.

An additional recommendation pertains to the training of staff and parents in eligible ESEA Chapter 1 schools.

- ***We suggest that an alternative model to the current staff development approach be provided for the benefit of eligible schools. Once a school qualifies for ESEA Chapter 1 funding, there should be a provision that allows the school to use a portion of the school's Chapter 1 funds to provide training to all staff.***

There are times when a Chapter 1 school may lose its trained Chapter 1 teachers during the school year, leaving the school without replacements capable of continuing the services provided to Chapter 1 students. Such interruptions of services are costly in terms of lack of student progress. Further, in schools where most teachers have not been trained and only a few of them are familiar with the Chapter 1 goals and objectives, strategies and techniques, and materials and equipment, the need to improve the achievement of the Chapter 1 student by coordinating the direction of the regular classroom program and that of the ESEA Chapter 1 program becomes an insurmountable objective.

- ***Finally, we support the idea, probably already advanced by others, that school districts, particularly those with large Chapter 1 allocations, be able to set aside a certain percentage of the Chapter 1 funds for research and development projects.***

Such projects would develop, validate, and disseminate information on what works effectively in Chapter 1 programs. We feel this idea has a great potential for providing essential information that may help the school principal and his or her staff to generate ideas that may revolutionalize Chapter 1 and to enhance the effectiveness of the programs.

ART KONO
Interim Director, Department of Compensatory Education
Seattle Public Schools
Seattle, Washington

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1, the largest federally funded educational program, is designed to provide additional educational opportunities for students who are not performing at grade level, mainly in the areas of reading and mathematics. The program focuses on helping the targeted students (1) learn appropriate grade-level skills and knowledge; (2) improve their mastery of those basic and advanced skills taught in the regular school program; and (3) succeed in the district's regular academic program. Services provided must be supplemental and of sufficient size, scope, and quality to facilitate growth in learning.

Since its inception as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 and, later, as Chapter 1, this program has provided hope for many students who needed that extra amount of time and support in learning to read and do mathematics. However, like all other programs, Chapter 1 has its strengths as well as its drawbacks.

With the imminent reauthorization of the Chapter 1 program in 1993, it is only fitting that we all scrutinize the program carefully. With scrutiny and reflection will come a better sense of direction and understanding of what changes need to be made to make it stronger, more effective, more flexible and dynamic.

The commentary that follows discusses the strengths and weaknesses of Chapter 1 in the areas of (1) strategies for program improvement and evaluation and (2) coordination with other federal, state, and local programs in the context of overall education spending; it then recommends options for reformulating the program, while maintaining the focus on the education of low-income students.

STRATEGIES FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND EVALUATION

Although the following strengths and weaknesses are by no means definitive, they represent the most often discussed strengths and weaknesses of the Chapter 1 program.

Strengths

First, the Chapter 1 Program Improvement Plan forces districts to assess annually the effectiveness of their projects in improving student performance both on standardized tests and on classroom-based desired outcomes. This helps to ensure systematic evaluation and monitoring of the targeted students' progress. Further, a special school-improvement plan has to be made for improving the individual building projects that are not effective.

Second, collaboration and teaming of effort between Chapter 1, regular classroom staff, and parents for building a school-improvement plan for increasing program effectiveness is a requirement. This required collaboration of effort highlights the need for accountability of the total staff for bringing about increased learning for Chapter 1 students and for working closely with parents in planning and implementing improvement strategies.

Third, the state education agency provides assistance to the schools identified as needing to build a school improvement plan. This assistance further increases the probability that Chapter 1 students will, indeed, receive the kind of help they really need. The varied forms of assistance available to such schools include, but are not limited to, the following: training and retraining for both Chapter 1 and regular staff; help in developing curricula that have been effective in similar schools; help in replicating promising practices from effective-schools models; and the development of innovative strategies for enhancing parent involvement in the school and in their children's education.

Fourth, the success of Chapter 1, as measured by the evaluation of student progress over the years, has made it possible for the program to enjoy a long life of funding appropriations. Other programs have died along the way and have ceased to exist, but Chapter 1 has remained a favorite with many, including students, parents, teachers, and district administrators. Even Congress seems to regard the program as a favorite child, perhaps because of the built-in ability to constantly monitor and audit the program and to use numerical means of measuring student progress as justification for appropriating funds for the program.

The 1991-1992 annual budget for the program of $6.2 billion shows an increase of $1.9 billion over the 1987-1988 level. The most important strength of the program is that the money is focused and reasonably protected for serving the neediest of the educationally disadvantaged.

Weaknesses

Perhaps the greatest shortcoming of Chapter 1 is that the expectations for student improvement are set at such low levels that it becomes too easy to show progress. For example, data compiled by the Department of Education for the 1989-1990 school year show that 27 of 40 states whose state plans for improvement had been assessed had adopted the minimum standard of "no gain or loss in NCE scores" for determining schools in need of program improvement. The smallest fraction of a gain, therefore, is regarded as an achievement gain. The question is, are these students really moving toward catching up with their peers, or even narrowing the academic performance gap between themselves and their peers?

As a result of the setting of low standards for showing student achievement, schools can avoid the label of needing school improvement. Thus, the ineffectiveness of their programs goes undetected.

Another shortcoming seems to be that, in reality, school improvement takes place in isolation, as many Chapter 1 teachers tend to operate in a vacuum, without any collaboration with the regular classroom teachers. One reason for this practice is that many teachers and administrators do not know that there is room for flexibility of operation while remaining in conformity with the stringent rules and regulations of Chapter 1 legislation. Another reason is that teachers and administrators sometimes develop their own spheres of influence, leading to isolation of efforts in a pullout program.

The lack of specificity in the guidelines for program improvement, which are passed on from the federal level to the state education agencies and down to the local education agencies (the school districts), may also be cited as a weakness of the program. There is not enough information to be of much help to teachers and administrators who may or may not have training in the assessment of student improvement.

A frequently mentioned weakness of Chapter 1 is that students are labeled. Terms such as "educationally disadvantaged" and "educationally deprived" only help to reinforce the "deficit" orientation of conventional wisdom. This way of thinking focuses on the assumption that these children (usually the children of the poor) have deficits which need to be remediated through emphasis on low-level computation skills and the sequential mastery of discrete basic literacy skills with heavy doses of phonics. Program improvement plans, then, tend to include more of the same prescriptions for student achievement rather than attempting to provide variety to meet the specific needs of students.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

The Hawkins-Stafford School Improvements Amendments of 1988 provide opportunities for more flexibility and creativity in designing effective Chapter 1 programs. The ways in which the amendments are interpreted will, naturally, lead to both a strengthening and a weakening of the program.

Strengths

The move to coordinate Chapter 1 with other federal, state and local programs opens doors for more flexibility and more innovative ways of serving students. Such integration of services can lead to more efficient use of both human and instructional material resources. For example, with careful planning, such programs as bilingual, special, Chapter 1, and regular education can be integrated in terms of staff and students, as students from these various groups may sometimes have the same needs at a given time. Split-funding, shared by the programs involved in the integrated approach, will of course be necessary for proper accounting procedures.

In addition, cost-sharing for equipment used by various federal, state, and local programs can benefit all concerned. Also, equipment bought with Chapter 1 money may be used up to a maximum of 10 percent of the time, or in some cases for slightly longer periods, as long as the program using it does not interfere with the Chapter 1 scheduled use and as long as the use does not shorten the life of the equipment.

Schools and attendance areas with at least 75 percent low-income students may have schoolwide improvement programs in which Chapter 1 funds are used to improve the school's entire educational program. In such a case, the district is allowed to serve all students without (1) directing services only to Chapter 1-eligible children; (2) providing documentation that only "educationally deprived" students are benefiting from Chapter 1 services; or (3) demonstrating that Chapter 1 funds are supplementing, not supplanting, regular classroom services.

Weaknesses

First, among the drawbacks of merged funding and programming is the concern that integrated services do not necessarily ensure instructionally appropriate services for the students most in need. There is, in fact, the distinct possibility that students with the greatest needs may once more fall between the cracks, mainly because they may not receive the individual and consistent assistance they need from time to time.

Second, change for the sake of change and innovation does not guarantee improvement in services to the students for whom Chapter 1 was originally designed. Instead, the changes sometimes seem to be more for the benefit and convenience of staff scheduling than for serving children's needs.

Third, federal limitations on the use of equipment for other programs may, in some cases, also limit true coordination with other federal, state, and local programs and result in more confusion and frustration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- ***This commentary strongly recommends that Chapter 1 remain a supplemental program for providing extra instructional assistance to underachieving students in low-income areas. The maintenance of a supplemental program increases the probability that children in need will be served and that an attempt will be made to meet their individual educational needs.***

Differentiated services and groupings within the supplemental program can take several forms, depending on the individual, developmental needs and learning style of each student. The delivery of appropriate, differentiated services at times appropriate for each student, then, would require assessment procedures and consistent monitoring practices which accurately describe student progress and needs at any given time.

Without the supplement, not supplant, stipulation, Chapter 1 funds may be misused, or not used for purposes beneficial to educationally and economically needy students. Integral to the supplement, not supplant, requirement should be the policy that acceleration and prevention, rather than remediation, be the driving force of the program.

- ***In view of the increased financial crisis being experienced by larger numbers of families, funding should be increased to twice the present size, with a new formula for allocation of funds.***

In such a formula, instead of the state education agency dividing up the federal grant among the counties (based on the census poverty figures for the counties), amounts would be allocated based on the concentrations of low-income students in the 1990 census. In addition, allocation "points" (additional amounts) would be given according to the number of students in each district whose standardized scores fall within a specified range (e.g., the 10th to 25th percentile).

- ***Rules and regulations should be defined with more specificity in order to reduce the incidence of state and district interpretations, which may differ basically from the intent of the laws governing Chapter 1.***

Time and effort reporting methods, for example, need to be more specific and consistent as, very often, the sheer amount of paperwork necessary for time and effort reporting creates major stumbling blocks to the development of creative and flexible Chapter 1 programs.

School improvement needs to become a positive, integral part of the program, rather than a form of punishment for lack of students' aggregate achievement of normal curve equivalent gains and/or achievement of classroom-based desired outcomes performance.

To encourage more efficient use of funds for serving needy students through the integration of federal categorical programs (Chapter 1, bilingual education, special education) with baseline programs, there should be increased flexibility of rules and regulations governing the categorical programs. Special exceptions could be built into the regulations for districts or schools in those districts that have two or three of the programs. Because bilingual education and Chapter 1 are compensatory education programs, regulations ought to be more flexible to make it possible for flexible instructional groupings of students enrolled in these programs in a given school.

- ***With regard to an integrated model, the recommendation would be for an intensive, continuous staff development component, a parent involvement component, and a strong evaluation component, using both standardized and informal, alternative measurements of progress.***

With the design of an integrated service model comes the need for specially developed teacher-education programs. For example, a program is presently being developed in Seattle for an "integrated services teacher" certificate for kindergarten through eighth grade teacher-education candidates.

This single program approach to certification will be delivered through a neighboring university and will provide candidates with all or some combinations of the necessary endorsements and/or certificates required to teach across special programs (e.g., reading/mathematics, Chapter 1 instruction, special education, and bilingual/ESL). Teachers graduating from such a program will be well prepared to address the needs of all the students in a diverse, multicultural environment.

- ***Recommendations for nontraditional services include a "whole-family approach" which would utilize as many community resources as needed, including family counseling services, health clinics, food banks, clothing centers, and literacy training for adults.***

Within the whole-family approach to meeting the needs of the students, Chapter 1 funds could pay for family-support workers, counselors, home-school liaison persons, as well as anger-management training and drug/alcohol abuse counseling. In addition, the Even Start program should be expanded and should become an integral part of the Chapter 1 program.

- ***A recommended alternative option for middle school and high school students would be an experiential model.***

Through this model, students would receive a wide variety of life experiences, which may be work related, vocational education related, and/or community services related. This model would focus on building higher-order thinking skills, self-worth, and mature approaches to problem solving and applied learning.

DEBORAH M. McGRIFF

Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools
Detroit, Michigan

In response to your request, I have set forth ideas for possible change to be considered in the reauthorization of the Chapter 1 legislation. The recommended changes address the allocation process and the program-improvement aspects of the legislation.

ALLOCATION PROCESS

Until 1988, the legislation mandated that Chapter 1 resources be distributed to schools exclusively on the basis of number and academic need of students to be served. The present law provided, for the first time, an option to reward schools for past successes. This was done by allowing the inclusion of students remediated by the program in the count of students for allocation purposes.

- ***Remediated students should be counted for allocation purposes, as a regular aspect of the new legislation. Thus, the Chapter 1 allocation would serve as an incentive for success, rather than a reward for failure.***

At present a district with as few as ten children in poverty receives a Chapter 1 allocation. Consequently, almost every school district in the nation receives these funds. This dilutes the effect that the funding provides for children in the most poverty-ridden school districts.

- ***The legislation should be modified to require a district to possess an average poverty of at least 25 percent before it can receive any funds.***

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

The present legislation provides for a demonstration of accountability. Schools whose aggregate gains over *one* year measure below a statewide minimum must design a program-improvement plan. After having implemented that plan for *one* year without the appropriate aggregate gain, a school must jointly with the state department of education revise the plan.

- ***One year for both the demonstration of accountability and the implementation of the plan is insufficient time to measure accountability or to effect change. Lack of gain and measure of successful change should be measured at least over a two-year span.***

The special funding provided by the legislation to the districts for program improvement is presently restricted for use exclusively in the implementation of program-improvement plans. Planning change requires the input of local school constituencies. Such input, often scheduled after school hours or on weekends, requires funding.

- ***The legislation should free this funding for the use of planning and/or implementation of program-improvement efforts.***

JOHN A. MURPHY

Superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Charlotte, North Carolina

The Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments of 1988 were a step in the right direction. Those amendments mandated accountability for students' performance, provided opportunity for flexibility and creativity in the pursuit of performance results, stressed higher-order thinking as opposed to drill and practice, mandated coordination of the Chapter 1 program with the regular program, promoted the concept that the success of disadvantaged children is the responsibility of the entire school, and reinforced accountability with an increased emphasis on parent involvement.

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools not only subscribe to, but work to realize, these concepts by operating on the principle that all children can learn. A significant gap exists, however, between intent and reality. Bureaucratic rules from the federal and state levels, rather than desired student outcomes, determined at the local level, run Chapter 1. Chapter 1 is often one more label applied to students who already have too many labels. The emphasis is on monitoring and compliance versus flexibility, innovation, and commitment.

The vision of Chapter 1 must be the pursuit of excellence and equity for all students. This vision can be realized by operating on the principle that all children can learn; by focusing on results rooted in high expectations, with consequent success; by pursuing equity of outcome rather than equity of input alone; by viewing excellence and equity as synonymous; by empowering parents as educational partners, not peripheral others; and by remedying and preventing failure.

There is no doubt that compliance issues are important, i.e., determining eligibility criteria, etc., but they should be seen as the foundation for the paradigm, not the paradigm itself. The law should be written to protect children, to ensure that those most in need receive services, and to allow local school districts the flexibility necessary to create and control the conditions for student success.

Permit me to make the following specific suggestions as to how Chapter 1 can move from an emphasis on compliance to an emphasis on commitment.

- ***Require local districts to establish realistic outcomes that can be measured.***

Local districts need to be able to establish those outcomes, with concomitant standards of excellence, and then determine the criteria and the means by which student achievement in relation to the outcomes will be measured and evaluated. Furthermore, progress should be measured over a period of three to five years, rather than annually. Annual evaluation based on NCE gains promotes an emphasis on minimum competency, not mastery of knowledge and skill necessary for success.

- ***Provide opportunity for flexibility and creativity in the pursuit of performance results.***

Current law requires that no more than 5 percent of Chapter 1 funds may be used for innovation. Clearly, that figure needs to be at least 25 percent if flexibility and creativity are real goals of the law.

- ***Coordinate the Chapter 1 program with the regular school program.***

This can be accomplished only if local districts are allowed to adjust programs and instruction to students' needs. The current emphasis on compliance and monitoring requires that changes in program can occur only through program amendments submitted to, and approved by, the SEA. Districts can "monitor" this internally.

- ***Make the entire school responsible for the success of disadvantaged children.***

Current regulations discourage this by very restrictive reins on the application of schoolwide solutions. At present, 75 percent of a school's population must be Chapter 1-eligible before a schoolwide program may be put in place. To address quality as well as quantity issues, that number needs to be 50 percent of the student population. Furthermore, Chapter 1 departments need to be able to convert positions to dollars and dollars to positions, as needed, to meet instructional needs.

Greater financial support for early-childhood initiatives needs to be available if the aim of Chapter 1 is truly having children succeed in the regular program. Early intervention is the key to sustained student success. Currently only 8 percent of Chapter 1 participants are in K and pre-K programs.

In summary, let me paraphrase Mary Jean LeTendre. Chapter 1 needs to move:

From	To
Following the letter of the law	Following the spirit of the law
Providing services easiest to document	Maximizing student learning
Focusing on bookkeeping	Focusing on education
Emphasis on compliance	Emphasis on commitment.

ROBERT J. NEARINE
Special Assistant, Evaluation, Research, and Testing
Hartford Public Schools
Hartford, Connecticut

CHANGES IN THE EXISTING FORMULA

I recognize that while the passage of ESEA was intended to provide supplementary services to educationally disadvantaged children living in poor neighborhoods, the political implications of the funding meant that virtually every district will be served. While it seems reasonable that the federal government should target Chapter 1 funds to the severest pockets of poverty, and perhaps irrespective of the numbers of youngsters who will be involved (e.g., rural and urban districts), in all probability even the wealthiest districts will continue to be funded.

This widespread distribution of funds will remain a political reality unless and until appropriate decisionmakers realize that limited Chapter 1 funds should be retargeted because of the need and the legislative intent of the program. A change in the definition of educational disadvantagement (e.g., below average) might help target services to the most educationally disadvantaged students, if a more restrictive national definition were used.

CHAPTER 1 AND OTHER CATEGORICAL AID

Without researching the legislative history, it is my understanding that the original Title I ESEA legislation encouraged and assumed funding in conjunction with other federal sources. For example, in Titles 3, 7, and 8 a funding priority was given to schools and districts with high numbers/percentages of Chapter 1-eligible youngsters. This concept was also incorporated in other funding programs at both the federal and state levels, where Chapter 1 schools received a funding priority. While these points may not be incorporated in the current legislation, it is my guess that they can at least be inferred, and possibly encouraged, given the legislative history of the program.

Local Services

I have several concerns about how the requirement that districts assess their educational efforts are applied and how the results can be interpreted. While the school and student program-improvement requirements are conceptually sound, implementation creates several problems.

In the first instance, the regulations refer alternately to school program improvement and school improvement, although the legislation seems to imply only the former. Interchangeable usage has allowed state and other agencies to push their own school-improvement agendas under the often mistaken belief that poor school results mean poor Chapter 1 programs, while poor program results indicate problems with the school.

At the same time, at least one state department of education is reluctant to modify its reporting process so as to focus on programs and not on schools. For this reason, there is often a local reluctance to become identified with program-improvement activities. Because this issue has not been communicated well to the public, coupled to the fact that the process can bounce a school in and out of program improvement on a yearly basis, it continues to create much concern.

Some flexibility should be given to local districts in determining whether a program requires improvement. While an accountability structure must be retained, the state might have some flexibility in exempting a school, perhaps on a one-time basis, for causes other than those which are presently listed in the regulations. At the same time, other indicators of need or success should be considered along with test scores.

With the present regulations, some feel that it is better to list only one measurable objective in the Chapter 1 application so as to avoid the possible stigma of program improvement. And since program-improvement funds are limited, acquisition of these funds may not be worth the negative publicity.

Emphasis on the use of multiple indicators, nontraditional assessments, and some latitude in interpreting test scores (measurement error, etc.) should be considered. While the importance of programs correcting their own problems must continue to be emphasized, more reason to the process is needed.

EUGENE D. OWENS
Chapter 1 Coordinator, Laurel School District
Laurel, Mississippi

SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

Strengths

Students are not labeled in schoolwide project schools. In the past, labeling has hurt students who already suffered from low self-esteem. Teachers and assistant teachers have higher expectations of students who are not labeled Chapter 1.

Students are not pulled from classes, such as science, social studies, music, art, and physical education. Being pulled out of regular class gave students the feeling they were always playing catch-up.

Schoolwide projects have allowed our district to implement computer-assisted instruction in reading and math. Because all students can be served, scheduling is not a nightmare. Computers are used effectively throughout the day, and vacant periods are few.

Our district has received excellent assistance from the state Chapter 1 staff.

Shortcomings

The method of evaluating schoolwide projects needs to be simplified. Describe several methods of evaluation and allow districts to choose the most reliable one.

Eligible school districts sometimes choose not to go schoolwide because of the extensive regulations and requirements for needs assessing, project writing, evaluation, and maintenance of effort. Again, simplify. Allow schools with 75 percent free/reduced lunch counts to improve the entire school without excessive requirements. The need is there as evidenced by the low income level of the school.

If districts cannot maintain local effort, allow them to continue schoolwide projects if reasonable explanations (economic conditions, state budget cuts) exist for shortfall in funding.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT: SHORTCOMINGS

State requirements for NCE gains are too high. Schools should not be placed in program improvement based on one year's progress or lack of progress. Desired outcomes should be long-range goals; they should not be used to determine whether a school is in need of program improvement or not.

Make improvement a part of the regular project every year, not a separate compartment/department. Allow districts to look at achievement over several years and decide what areas show weaknesses year after year, what changes are needed to improve these areas, and how the changes can be implemented in order to impact educationally deprived, low-income students.

The regulations, paper work, and tracking of individual students in a mobile society can become overwhelming. Districts need to track progress of groups of students, not individual students. The progress of individual students should remain the responsibility of teachers and individual schools.

Because the state changes the required achievement test every few years, the reliability of evaluation data can certainly be questioned. Too much emphasis is placed on standardized testing. Alternative long-range methods of evaluation should be sought.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT: SHORTCOMINGS

Parent involvement must be an important element of the Chapter 1 program, but many parents of Chapter 1 students who need to be reached are often unreachable. When they are reached, change is difficult for parents of older students. Chapter 1 should continue to work with all parents, but concentrate resources and effort on new parents and parents with children up to three years of age. Hopefully, fewer children will then become Chapter 1 students.

Efforts should be coordinated with other agencies. Coordination between federal, state, county, and local agencies and organizations should be coordinated so that some services are not duplicated and others are ignored.

JOHN A. PFAFF
Principal/Chapter 1 Coordinator, Sheboygan Area School District
Sheboygan, Wisconsin

STRENGTHS OF CHAPTER 1

Chapter 1 in recent years has been a successful program for addressing the educational needs of low-income children. The increased flexibility in programming and the direction to provide more coordination with other programs has greatly strengthened the service to Chapter 1 children.

The mandated parental-involvement regulations are very important. The rules and regulations provide the partnership between home and school but do not strap the local education agency (LEA) into specific ideas of what constitutes involvement. The alternatives available to the LEA are very valuable. Districts have options available in programming for their Chapter 1-eligible children. This flexibility includes grade spans and curricular offerings.

In the past two years, the Department of Education has become more proactive in addressing in-service activities on a nationwide basis. The results have been positive for the LEA. As an example, the department has stressed the value of preinstruction versus remedial instruction and the increased amount of data indicating the strengths of various components, such as pullout versus in-class. The Department of Education should continue and increase, if possible, this practice.

The committee of practitioners process has been greatly appreciated by local chapter leaders. This opportunity allows for people involved in Chapter 1 locally to help guide and direct issues at the state level. This practice should continue with the reauthorization.

SHORTCOMINGS

An area which is of some concern is the level of funding. In the past two or three years, increases have been more favorable. However, many children continue not to be served because funds are limited at the LEA level. One alternative to the funding shortage could be to serve low-income families in the elementary and middle level (EC-8) or serve strictly elementary students (EC-5).

Data indicate that greater educational successes have been found in the lower-age ranges. Because of these data, one might question whether Chapter 1 allocations utilized at the middle and secondary levels are the most effective means of spending funds. Another alternative that would allow the limited funds to be more effectively expended would be to increase the minimum percentage of low-income level served, with the LEA targeting only the extremely needy schools.

A second concern can be addressed through a change in the targeting process. In many LEAs, pockets of poverty can be found in noneligible schools. Often these pockets exist because of low-income housing. It would be advantageous to the LEA and to specific schools if the Chapter 1 regulations were modified to include these pockets. The targeting procedure could remain the same, but with an amendment which would allow the LEA to serve children in low-income housing in untargeted areas.

The third concern area is standardized assessments for children in the lower primary years. We must continue to have a standard measure for the upper primary and higher (grades 3-12) student population. Standardized measures are important when used in conjunction with nonstandard measures to determine student and program success. I would urge the legislation to eliminate the use of standardized tests in early childhood through grade 2. Many LEA-developed measures are more useful in determining growth or success of the students and the program. The locally developed assessments are less costly for the district, more meaningful to the teacher and the parent, and less traumatic for the young child.

Service to the private school continues to be addressed annually at many LEAs. Even though separation of church and state is important, it seems some flexibility is needed in serving children in nonpublic sites. Many funds are spent on building rental, transportation of students, and/or classroom units to serve a few children. With funding constantly an issue, it seems reasonable to modify the regulation concerning the neutral site.

Program improvement is a positive addition to the regulations but has some problems when implemented. Problems exist when (1) some schools cycle on/off program improvement every other year, (2) schools are placed on program improvement because of one child, (3) schools are on program improvement because of a mobile population, or (4) the test measure is inappropriate. The process might be more valuable if the program-improvement plan covered a two-year period rather than one year. This would eliminate the on/off cycle and assist the schools with smaller numbers of students.

Finally, parent involvement has been working very successfully in many LEAs. A form of program improvement for parent involvement is necessary for the LEA that does only the minimum to be in compliance. If parents evaluate the parent component and help write a plan for improving the parent component (including signatures), LEAs that merely follow the regulations will begin providing more meaningful parent activities. These activities must be centered on how the parent is trained to support the learning process of his or her child or children.

RONALD S. SCHNEIDER
Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects School-Based Management/Shared Decisionmaking (SBM/SDM) Initiative
New York City Public Schools
New York, New York

The Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects SBM/SDM Initiative in New York City is founded on the concept of group problem solving and shared decisionmaking to restructure the school's educational programs to improve student achievement.[1] It differs from other initiatives in that it allows Chapter 1 and New York State PCEN funds to be used along with New York City tax-levy resources to support programs to address the needs of the entire student population in a school.

A determination that 75 percent of the students enrolled in a school or residing in the school-attendance area are from low-income families and that 10 percent of the students meet Chapter 1 academic eligibility criteria certifies the eligibility of a school for a schoolwide project. If a school decides to participate in this initiative, it is required to establish a schoolwide projects SBM/SDM team to develop a plan for total school improvement that serves the needs of all students in the school, especially those who are educationally disadvantaged.

Many, if not most, public high schools in New York City that are eligible for Chapter 1 have student populations that are overwhelmingly poor and educationally disadvantaged. Most of the students are two or more years behind in reading and math skills according to standardized tests, they routinely fail two or more subjects each term, their attendance is very poor, and they drop out in alarmingly high numbers. Servicing students whose academic records are exceedingly poor by separating them from other students whose records are just as abysmal, but who have not qualified as Chapter 1-eligible because they have not submitted their free lunch forms, will have little or no effect on the former's academic achievement, nor will it keep them from dropping out of school; moreover, the latter group will continue to be underserved.

Although Chapter 1 funds make up only a small portion of the total budget for schools, these moneys should be used to benefit all students, especially when most of the school population is poor and educationally disadvantaged. The schools in which I work are all Chapter 1 "schoolwide-improvement" schools. Each school formed an SBM/SDM team and developed an education plan that integrated Chapter 1, PCEN, and local funds.

Instead of the usual policy of pulling the Chapter 1 students out of regular classrooms and in the process labeling them as "different" or "stupid" and encouraging separate institutional and evaluation processes, the members of the team have searched for better ways to educate Chapter 1 students in the context of the entire school community. This process has often forced the whole school—administrators, teachers, parents, and students—to take a better look at the overall school practices and strategies with regard to school size, pedagogy, curriculum, assessment and the social, emotional issues facing adolescents.

---

[1] In my present position, I have been working extensively with alternative high schools. I have been providing the faculties of these schools with technical assistance and advice on school restructuring and professional development issues related to pedagogy, curriculum, performance-based assessment, student advisory groups, parent involvement, and student community service.

The opportunity for dialogue among these groups has resulted in real school restructuring. Schools have broken down into free-standing, independent minischools. Professional development activities have begun, emphasizing cooperative learning, interdisciplinary courses, performance-based assessment, and teachers acting as advisers to small groups of students. Staff have reached out to reform-minded groups, such as the Coalition of Essential Schools, and have attended conferences and institutes run by this and other organizations. They have returned to their schools further committed to school restructuring and change and have shared with their colleagues their new knowledge.

It is still too early to determine whether the Chapter 1 schoolwide-improvement initiative has had a positive effect on student achievement, attendance, and dropout rates in the schools that I am servicing, since they are only in the first or second year of implementation. It appears, however, that the restructuring efforts have had a positive effect on school setting and staff morale. And we have reason to believe that these factors will have a positive effect on student success indicators in the future.

All schools participating in the schoolwide-improvement program will conduct a third-year federal evaluation of student performance. It is my recommendation that this evaluation not be based solely on how these students perform on standardized tests. I believe that these students should also be judged by performance-based assessment methods which may measure with more validity what these students know and are able to do.

Finally, if Chapter 1 schoolwide improvement is expanded, I would strongly recommend that this program be very carefully monitored by the federal government to ensure that the participating schools are implementing the goals and objectives of their education plans and especially that the poor and educationally disadvantaged are appropriately served.

ROBERT R. SPILLANE

Superintendent, Fairfax County Public Schools
Fairfax, Virginia

The provision of Chapter 1 federal funding to assist "educationally deprived" students and their parents in schools with high percentages of low-income families has made a powerful impact upon students and school divisions across the United States. In the last 27 years, Chapter 1 funds have provided the impetus for school divisions to acknowledge disparity and to improve instructional opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students.

The central strength of Chapter 1 is the focus of service for students identified as most in academic need. These students are offered additional instruction that promotes academic achievement; their parents are helped to work with them in a positive manner at home; and their Chapter 1 teachers and classroom teachers receive additional training that facilitates more effective instruction. This training often has an effect upon the whole school staff. In my opinion these are crucial aspects of Chapter 1 and should be maintained in reauthorization.

Services provided to Chapter 1 students vary greatly from school division to school division. Local school divisions must continue to have the flexibility to determine appropriate services for students and their parents. At the same time, school divisions need research-based information that will help them design effective instructional programs. Greater flexibility in the designation of schoolwide projects *may* be helpful, but such projects must also promote the achievement of the identified, most-in-need students.

Difficulties arise from working through a maze of Chapter 1 federal and state regulations. One area of difficulty is the procedure for evaluating local Chapter 1 programs and identifying schools in need of improvement. A nationally normed standardized test administered on a 12-month cycle produces the only data used to make this determination. While Chapter 1 "desired outcomes" are identified and measured by local school systems, these data are not used in any substantial way. It is my belief that the use of multiple assessment measures over a time span of several years is a better way to produce evaluation data and identify schools or programs in need of improvement.

Finally, my greatest concern is remaining true to the original purpose of the Chapter 1 legislation—promoting the achievement of the students most in academic need. All policy decisions must be judged on this criterion. Chapter 1 was not—and should not be—designed to equalize school funding across or within states, promote private school choice, create national standards or testing systems, or provide discretionary funding without providing direct instruction to students most in academic need. In reauthorization, great care must be taken in order to craft a national program, responsive to local situations, that truly assists those students and their parents.

Chapter Six

SCHOOL PERSONNEL

MARGARET M. BALDWIN

Teacher
Williamsburg, Virginia

Because my experience with Chapter 1 has been at the local level, my commentary will address issues that are associated with providing supplemental services for individually selected students. First, the strengths of the Chapter 1 program will be discussed, followed by areas of concern. Finally, suggestions and recommendations will be offered.

STRENGTHS

The Chapter 1 program provides an opportunity for Chapter 1 students to receive a double dose of instruction. A majority of Chapter 1 participants have the ability to learn and to meet the academic objectives, but because of a lack or weakness in their entering behaviors and experiences they have difficulty relating to the learning or finding meaning in the learning.

Chapter 1 teachers are able to work with small groups of students to help these learners fill the gaps in their learning experiences. By working closely with the child's classroom teacher, the Chapter 1 teacher is familiar with the classroom's ongoing learning objectives and can provide alternative strategies to help the learner meet these objectives.

In line with the previously discussed strength is the availability of instructional equipment and supplies. Even in times of fiscal budget constraints at the district level, Chapter 1 funding enables its teachers to order current and state-of-the-art equipment and supplies. This access to new materials helps the teacher provide new and different learning experiences for Chapter 1 participants. The risk of duplicating a lesson that has been taught in the child's classroom is minimized. New materials help maintain the student's interest and increase the likelihood that learning will occur.

Chapter 1 provides many opportunities for the parents of Chapter 1 participants to become actively involved in the education of their children. Parents are invited to visit and observe their child in action during their Chapter 1 time. Parents are also encouraged to volunteer in Chapter 1 classes. Newsletters are sent home on a regular basis, as are notices of scheduled workshops and other after-school or evening Chapter 1 activities. Chapter 1 continues to be at the forefront of helping to establish and maintain the important home-school connection, especially with a parent population who may not have had a positive school experience themselves.

On overriding strength of Chapter 1 is the effect it seems to have on the self-esteem and self-concept of children who begin to experience success. This personal commodity is the fuel that enables learning to continue to occur. This increased level of self-concept has also been noticed in parents who begin to realize that they do have a stake in their child's education and that they can make a positive difference.

CONCERNS

One of the biggest frustrations of a Chapter 1 teacher is not being able to serve all of the students who could benefit from participation in Chapter 1. Students' names remain on a waiting list until a vacancy occurs. Depending on the transiency of the school population, children can remain on the waiting list all year and never have the chance to receive Chapter 1 services. In one situation that I am aware of, two Chapter 1 teachers were teaching a total of 90 students, yet 40 students remained on the waiting list.

Scheduling and staffing sometimes limit the number of students who can participate in Chapter 1 even though they qualify. The concern is that these learners will fall through the cracks—they do not qualify for special education and are not learning disabled, but they continue to experience difficulty in meeting their classroom learning objectives because the Chapter 1 teachers are already servicing the maximum total number of students.

Anyone involved in instruction knows that motivation (or lack thereof) is one of the biggest concerns confronting educators. Motivating students who have not experienced much academic success is a challenge for teachers, as is motivating the parents to become actively involved in their child's education.

Extrinsic motivators (stickers, medals, certificates, free dinners, etc.) are necessary strategies for getting motivation started. My concern is that too much emphasis is placed on these extrinsic motivators and little effort is made to move toward intrinsic motivation. Students and parents as well come to expect something for their efforts and participation. The risk is that the motivator becomes more important than the effort and participation.

In line with the emphasis on extrinsic motivators is the cost that is incurred for providing these items. In one Chapter 1 program, all students (and teachers for that matter) were given T-shirts and canvas tote bags with the school system's Chapter 1 logo printed on each one. At the end of the year a dinner was held for all Chapter 1 families and staff. Over 1000 people attended. The resulting bill was over $15,000. The amount of money spent on the dinner alone could have made a healthy contribution toward staffing another Chapter 1 teacher.

At the end of each year the budget surplus is calculated and Chapter 1 teachers are told to spend—get anything and everything on your dream list. Most teachers would kill to have such an opportunity, but ordering for the sake of ordering occurs. Evidently, if there is too much money carried over into the next budget, Chapter 1 runs the risk of loosing that money. It seems that the philosophy is, if it wasn't spent, then it wasn't needed so the amount may not be returned to the budget.

Finally, the issue of a pullout program creates concerns and sometimes conflict. Because of scheduling, students sometimes miss essential classroom instruction while they are attending Chapter 1. Likewise, students in Chapter 1 may miss their classroom recess, free time, or other activities. Feelings of resentment on the part of the students can result, and they will not hesitate to tell you that they hate Chapter 1. Some students, especially older ones, "hate" Chapter 1 because they are embarrassed at being pulled out of their classrooms. Instructional time is lost when the Chapter 1 teacher has to deal with the attitudes and emotions that arise in these instances.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Base the staffing of Chapter 1 teachers on the numbers of students that need to be served. While staffing is always a budget issue, surplus funds could be used for this purpose rather than for end-of-year shopping sprees through educational catalogs.
- Examine alternative delivery times. With increased numbers of parents working outside the home, after-school programs have grown in popularity. Not only do these programs provide a safe place for children to wait until a parent is home, but they also provide an opportunity for students to receive instruction. One system designed an after-school program that emphasized the development of reading comprehension strategies. The teachers involved in this program worked on an adjusted schedule (noon to 6 p.m.).
- Investigate the possibility of the Chapter 1 teachers working in the home classroom. While this depends on such variables as space, scheduling, teacher and administrator preference, teacher compatibility, and numbers of Chapter 1 students in the class, it would make a viable alternative to a total pullout program.

NANCY D. BOOTH
First Grade Teacher, Laporte School
Laporte, Minnesota

As a first and second grade teacher for 17 years in a small rural school and a Chapter 1 teacher for one of those years, I have seen the Chapter 1 program in action on a local level, for better and for worse. The school enrollment has been about 300 students, K-12, with the elementary grades having been served well with Chapter 1 funds. The junior high and high school program, however, has been almost nonexistent.

The Chapter 1 program has been an exceptionally good educational service to elementary-age disadvantaged students, providing assistance to many needy children. It is the best program I know that allows school districts to use federal funding to aid low-income families. However, at the local level, I see some areas in which the program could be better implemented.

I would like to have the federal government provide a definite procedure for local districts to follow that would ensure the fulfillment of Chapter 1 goals. I have found the lack of leadership a stumbling block in our district. More specifically, with the exception of 2 years in the past 17, there has been no lead teacher in our school. I was the sole Chapter 1 teacher one of those years and a colleague was the second year. During the other years, Chapter 1 aides were hired and thrown into classrooms without specific instruction in carrying out Chapter 1 criteria; there was not a lead teacher or a director.

The elementary principal was in charge of setting up the program and the evaluation, neither area apparently receiving top priority in her line of duties. The local program would benefit greatly with the assignment of a lead teacher to implement all Chapter 1 instruction. This teacher should attend training workshops prior to his or her assignment, as should all Chapter 1 instructional aides. Our district has been negligent in providing this kind of teacher and aide preparation. It seems as though the federal government could make this training a requirement if the district is to receive funding.

During the year that I was Chapter 1 teacher, we had a pullout program that worked extremely well. I prefer the pullout program to mainstreaming, because I think Chapter 1 students are better served if they can have a specific time slot to work in a tutorial setting with an aide or teacher. Most of these students work better in a quiet spot away from the noise and distractions of a mainstream classroom, and most do not mind the thought of "going down the hall" to the resource room.

A Chapter 1 teacher also has an advantage if he or she can work with a single student or a small group away from the distractions of the mainstream setting. (There might be an exception to this theory: if a classroom is large enough for a Chapter 1 teacher or aide to have a corner partitioned off, away from classroom distractions, mainstreaming can be advantageous. I have seen this work successfully.)

Mainstreaming of Chapter 1 students, in my opinion, is not nearly as efficient and workable as the pullout system. Too often I have seen Chapter 1 aides in a dilemma if they are supposed to be concentrating their tutoring on Chapter 1 students and are interrupted by mainstream students who also ask for their help. It is difficult to refuse help to any student in that situation, and, of course, we do not. But then we lose our focus on the Chapter 1 student, who probably needs our help more. This confusion is eliminated in the pullout situation.

The junior high and high school Chapter 1 program appears on paper at our school, but it is not being implemented. That is, we have the funding, but the program is not being carried out for what I believe to be the following reasons: (1) the high school administration is not convinced of the program's merits and (2) the high school teachers are not aware that they can request Chapter 1 services, nor do they have the leadership from their principal to be encouraged to do so. I would like to have more guidance from the federal government to insist upon cooperation from secondary teachers in carrying out the program at their level.

We have never had an after-school or summer program funded by Chapter 1. But if this were available to us, I am sure that we would establish some beneficial activities for low-income families. The stimulation during regular school hours has been proven valuable, and I know that supplemental nonschooltime programs would be popular. Parent and other community volunteers might be used to carry out such a program. I believe that the Chapter 1 program needs to tap the talents and resources of parents and community.

The evaluation of the Chapter 1 program in our school has been carelessly administered in the past. I would like to have the federal government provide more guidelines for implementation and actual requirements for follow-up studies and evaluation of local programs.

Federal funding has provided the very worthwhile Chapter 1 program, and we have seen positive results. I would appreciate additional funding for further growth and development of an already established and successful educational program. Because of our changing societal conditions (more families living at poverty level and below, more changes in family structure, and more foreign-speaking students), we see an increasing need for more services to our disadvantaged students. I have hope that our legislature will raise the limit on funding for disadvantaged students and students from low-income families.

MICHAEL CITRO
Principal, Sandalwood Elementary School
Baltimore, Maryland

This school year (1992-1993), Sandalwood Elementary School became a total Chapter 1 program because the participation in free and reduced-price lunches was over 75 percent. We used an extensive needs assessment in developing our Chapter 1 program.

In the early spring, we organized a planning committee to study every aspect of our program. The committee was composed of parents, teachers, and administrators, as well as members of the Chapter 1 staff. The planning committee then made comprehensive recommendations that directed the course of action for this year. This means that the ideas for our project were not based solely on students' test results, but came from parents, teachers, and administrators as well. Some highlights of our program follow:

Activity coordinator: The goal of the activity coordinator is to develop incentives to boost achievement, attendance, and student recognition through clubs, school and community activities, musicals, good work bulletin boards, etc.

Family and children's services of Central Maryland: The social worker will provide a full range of social work and counseling services. The goal of this program is to improve the quality of family relationships and student academic achievements and communications with the entire school staff. As the child's self-awareness and self-confidence increase, the child will function more appropriately both socially and academically in the classroom, as well as in the home and community.

Jostens computer program: This is a diagnostic prescriptive program that allows students to reinforce skills on an individual basis and provides immediate feedback to the student on his progress.

Half-day staff development: One half-day each month has been designated for staff development and planning activities. Some of the topics include language, prototypes, curriculum night for the community, written language, response logs and journals, and training for the Jostens computer program.

Service to fourth and fifth grades: Students in those classes are now eligible for Chapter 1 assistance, and instructional assistants are assigned to the students who have the greatest needs in language arts and math.

Lending library: Take-home packets to reinforce skills in reading and math.

Home visitor: This program provides additional supplemental help for kindergarten children who are in greatest need. This supplemental help is obtained by teaching the parents ways to help the children at home and by providing them the materials and strategies to help.

Parent liaison and parent involvement: The parent liaison coordinates all parent activities. She arranges for the training and placement of volunteers and, with incentive programs, encourages and motivates volunteer involvement. The parent liaison also promotes an awareness of Chapter 1 needs in the local school and countywide, and she keeps the lines of communication open between parent and school staff.

Record keeping: Teachers keep a skills checklist for each student. The skills are from the scope and sequence of reading skills for Baltimore County. They are updated on a regular basis. Paraprofessionals keep a daily log showing the reinforcement that each Chapter 1 student is receiving. The log shows the strategies and materials used, as well as how well the student is doing.

This program meets the needs of our school and we are grateful to have had input into how the money was allocated. That way, we were able to give precedence to our priorities. One aspect of our program that we particularly like is the fact that we have discontinued standardized testing in the kindergarten classes. The new system for identification depends heavily on teacher judgment and performance criteria.

JUDY DIERKER

Teacher, Virginia Heights Elementary School
Roanoke, Virginia

It is my firm conviction that Chapter 1 provides an excellent instructional program. The majority of the teachers in my school division have postgraduate degrees, experience, and a sincere commitment to helping low achieving children. Most of the problems I see with Chapter 1 deal with the administrative guidelines of the program at all levels, rather than the instructional program.

My biggest concern with Chapter 1 is how schools are chosen to be served with Chapter 1 funds. Last school year, my school district was able to serve children in schools where the low-income level was 43 percent or higher, while the adjoining county served children in schools where the low-income level was 6 percent. This meant that large groups of children in the city were low-income but were not eligible to be served.

I know there is a different way to determine which schools are eligible, and this makes schools with 25 percent low-income eligible, but that still leaves quite a few disadvantaged children not being served. I realize the logistics of trying to serve everyone would be impossible, but I do have concerns about the difference from one locality to another. Parents also are concerned about the number of children who would benefit from the Chapter 1 program and are not being served, especially children who move from a Chapter 1 school to a non-Chapter 1 school.

Delivery models are another area of concern for me. I firmly believe the pullout model is the most effective and efficient. In most cases, when a Chapter 1 teacher is involved with the in-class model, he or she becomes an aide working in a corner with a small group of children. It does not seem cost-effective to pay a teacher with a master's degree in reading to act as a teacher's aide.

The teachers in our system who have been forced into the in-class model are resented by the classroom teacher. The Chapter 1 teachers usually are allowed to work only with Chapter 1 children, and if they do any elaborate projects, the non-Chapter 1 children in the class feel left out. The in-class model makes it very difficult for the Chapter 1 teacher to plan and carry out some of the strategies she is trained to do in order to work most effectively with the Chapter 1 students.

If the teacher is utilized as a teacher and does team teaching, she is out of compliance because she is interacting with non-Chapter 1 children. I know that team teaching is acceptable in some models, but the paperwork needed to monitor the time spent with the Chapter 1 students and the other students is a nightmare.

One of the main arguments against pullout is that the children pulled out are labeled and upset about it. It has been my experience, and that of the teachers I know, that the children pulled out for the Chapter 1 program are envied and other children beg to be allowed to come to Chapter 1. We have parents calling the schools requesting Chapter 1 help, and we have to deny their requests because the children are not eligible.

It is very discouraging to continue to hear about the disadvantages of labeling children. I don't necessarily believe in labeling children, but I do believe in placing children in an environment where they can succeed most of the time; for many children, this is not in a regular classroom setting.

I believe that there should be more emphasis on the younger children and on parent education. We teach many of the "children of children" that we hear about on TV. For many of our parents, school was not a successful or even a good place to be, so I feel that we should be striving to help the parents see school as a good and even helpful place for them as well as their children.

We probably need to take programs to the homes and get involved when the children are tiny, not waiting to find them when the parents bring them to preschool. Perhaps we need to get more involved with the programs for pregnant teens, to help the mothers finish their education, as well as to help with parenting skills and baby-sitting, if that is what is necessary.

Currently, it is difficult for clients needing different educational and social services to have all their needs met. Clients cannot receive overlapping services from different agencies. It would be helpful if all the federal, state, and grant moneys could be coordinated to serve the same clients in different areas. Then, a conflict over which agency would serve a client would not exist, and clients could receive all the help they need.

The program I have been teaching for the last few years, a whole-language reading pullout program, has been successful. I feel the best way to teach Chapter 1 children is in small groups with hands-on activities with enough help to make the children successful in the group. The program is further enhanced when the children have a project, such as a self-made book, that they can take back to the classroom and share with their classmates.

I do have concerns about students who could be labeled "career Chapter 1 children." These are the slow learners who every year are learning and maintaining but still are unable to keep up with their age mates. As the years pass, they fall farther and farther behind their age mates, and their test scores continue to drop. If there are enough of these children in a school's Chapter 1 program, test scores will not be able to reflect the quality of work going on at the school or the true growth of the children.

Test scores and selection of Chapter 1 children are two areas I have a hard time explaining to other teachers as well as parents. I do not think standardized tests show the growth that takes place in children who are performing below the average of the other children in the class. I also have problems with the idea of test scores being the final vote as to whether or not a child will receive Chapter 1 services.

For example, I have had children test out of Chapter 1 (reading score above 50 percent) who I know can't read well and just had a good day for the test. I have also had children who have tested into Chapter 1 who are excellent readers but who can't take a test. And then there are the children who move into the school in the middle of the year who have no test score, but who obviously need help. We then give them an individualized achievement test to document their need for extra help.

If, however, the regulations stipulating which children should be served are relaxed too much, I am concerned in this day of budget cutting that the Chapter 1 money would be misspent by localities trying to lower the student-teacher ratio rather than providing over-and-above services to low-income low achievers.

BARBARA FUNDERBURK

Chapter 1 Teacher, Marshville Elementary School
Monroe, North Carolina

1. More federal funds are needed so that new, up to date materials and learning kits can be purchased. I received only about $30.00 worth of paperback books this year. Everything else I needed was purchased by my own checkbook.
2. A great deal of money has been spent on parental involvement. Parents participate hardly at all and so much planning time and Chapter 1 funds have almost been wasted. Many of our parents have no transportation and others just have difficulty attending functions for parents.

Everything else concerning Chapter 1 is good.

JUDY HAMPTON

Chapter 1 Prekindergarten Teacher
Fort Worth, Texas

I have taught Chapter 1 prekindergarten in the Fort Worth Independent School District for the past seven years. Our district receives Chapter 1 funds equally with Texas state funds for our program. To enter our Chapter 1 program, the child must

- Live in the low-income area boundaries of our school.
- Score no higher than seven on a ten-question screening.

The first criterion is certainly reasonable. I have no problem with that. But to give a child a ten-question screening and say that he or she can't make higher than seven or that he or she can't come to school is not reasonable. If the child scores eight or more, you are saying he or she is already too smart for school. Also you might conclude that we teach only ten concepts all year. This is preposterous at best. Many social skills as well as numerous academic skills are taught. Two of the questions on the prekindergarten screening are "How old are you?" and "What is your name?" I should hope a 4-year-old child was being taught these basic concepts at home. I would recommend not requiring this screening for eligibility. Living in the Chapter 1 area should be the only requirement.

Another change I would recommend is the pupil-teacher ratio. Currently it is 22 children to 2 adults, 1 teacher and 1 instructional assistant. I would recommend 16 to 2, which is also the NASEYC recommendation for 4-year-old programs. Disadvantaged children have more needs than others. Fewer children would give more one-on-one time.

If funds were increased, I would make several suggestions. First, I would increase the number of children served by Chapter 1 funded prekindergarten. We have a maximum of 90 children in prekindergarten with a waiting list. We have 110 in kindergarten. There's another classroom of children each year in our area not being served. Lowering the pupil-teacher ratio as I mentioned above would come under increased funding.

I would also suggest assessing the Chapter 1 schools for any major deficiencies in equipment. For example, our school, which is a Chapter 1 school (75 percent of the children in our building are on free lunch), does not have any playground equipment. The little bit we had was removed when a new wing was built. Our PTA does not have the resources that PTAs in upper-class neighborhoods have with which to supplement school needs.

Another suggestion is to have a snack furnished every day. The children have breakfast and lunch, but we eat lunch so early (10:30) that most are hungry again by the time we dismiss (2:45). We are in a low-income area, and I cannot say for sure that each child has a substantial supper. We could also use items most of us take for granted, such as toothbrushes and toothpaste to teach health with.

Our children do not go to many places around our city and do not have the same experiences other 4-year-olds do. Television brings a lot of our world to us, but for 4-year-olds, seeing firsthand is best. We do receive funds for three field trips a year. This money pays only for the bus. And we have to watch the mileage when we plan. I would propose six field trips in all, including funds to help pay entrance fees for two or three of these trips. We do not feel we can ask their parents for money, and non-admission places to visit are getting scarcer. First and second graders cannot write stories about animals, theater experiences, or things they have not experienced first hand.

One last suggestion is books, books, books. I have a "Read to Me at Home" plan in my classroom. This gets parents involved in their child's learning and promotes early reading skills. When you use books, they get worn out. I can always use books.

I realize I have gotten off into the "little things," but as a teacher I can see that these little things would make an already good program better. Chapter 1 makes a tremendous difference in disadvantaged children's lives. You can see it in a kindergarten class where five or six stand out for a lack of skills. They did not go to prekindergarten. You can see it in the upper grades, where small groups of children can get the extra one-on-one help they need in reading or math. And their test scores go up.

CONNIE HAY

Teacher, Franklin School
Madison, Wisconsin

I believe Chapter 1 is a very worthwhile program and delivers a very needed service. However, each year we seem to get more and more very low-income students from terrible backgrounds (abuse, neglect, parents in jail or on drugs, etc.). Each year we, Chapter 1 teachers, are given harder district and/or state goals to accomplish, more paperwork, and usually less money. The latter is what happens, in effect, when Chapter 1 money is maintained at the same level but when salaries go up. We teachers love our jobs, do a fine job of it, and are proud of what we do, but get burned out.

I am no expert in statistics or budgets, but I basically feel, from what I see, that we don't need to change existing formulas regarding which schools get money, equalizing school finances, or coordinating Chapter 1 and related federal and state programs. As a matter of fact I hope you don't make these changes. Generally, from what I've seen, changes such as these would result in more paperwork and less surety of funds.

If, for example, the support of Chapter 1 funding is shifted to the state or local districts, the Chapter 1 programs in general will be drastically cut or dropped. This won't be due to lack of need or lack of success of the current program but due solely to pressures to cut budgets and save taxpayers money. We need continued monetary support. We need to keep Chapter 1 a separate program.

Please do not combine or coordinate Chapter 1 with other programs. The only thing that would result would be less money and help going to the children we help and currently serve and more paperwork for the Chapter 1 teacher so the teacher has less time to teach and more pressure and burn out.

We do need to maintain our separate program status and to increase our financial support to enable us to give the very lowest students the kind of help they need. We have students coming to us in first and second grade many of whom, because of the severity of their problems, will truly learn only with individual help. Individual help is what many of the very lowest require.

Also we are seeing at our school, and experts nationwide are seeing, the value of Reading Recovery. I am a trained Reading Recovery teacher, with a master's degree in reading. I know that many of the students I teach really need and would really benefit from Reading Recovery help. However, our district has only limited money to spend on Reading Recovery, so many students don't receive this service. Also, it appears that the students who are most at-risk and most in need of this service are the students who lack the experiences, maturity, readiness, etc., to benefit from the program until they're in second grade. These children are just not to the point where they're ready to sit and stay focused and have the readiness to benefit from Reading Recovery until second grade.

My school is a primary education school. We believe each child should be taught and taken from where he or she is and nurtured and advanced. The program should fit the child, not the child fit the program. Such a philosophy supports offering help to children when they are ready to benefit from such help. These children, truly needing and ready for Reading Recovery at second-grade level, should be able to receive that help then. However, Reading Recovery is technically just offered to students in first grade. Therefore our district's Reading Recovery, the little we do have, cannot be available to these delayed and very needy second graders.

If, however, Chapter 1 funding was increased enough, Chapter 1 teachers who are, like me, trained in Reading Recovery, could give Reading Recovery services to second graders without forcing the Chapter 1 teacher to double their other class sizes in order to make up for giving these students the needed Reading Recovery help. The help wouldn't have to be labeled "Reading Recovery" but would in effect be the same as Reading Recovery. This help is what many second grade (and probably even third grade or older) nonreaders really need. We must be given the monetary help to give them the help they need without making the less slow students suffer by doubling their class sizes.

The second thing that needs to be done is not to constantly up the NCE gains, reading level gains, goals required, etc. This will improve if my first suggestion is implemented. Upping requirements is easy for administrators to do, but the pressure falls on the already overloaded teacher and it's unfair. All that happens is the conscientious teachers get stressed, overworked, and burned out even more. Many of the best teachers will probably get out of Chapter 1 teaching.

The third thing that could be done is to cut down on the required paperwork as much as possible. Proposals shouldn't have to be done from scratch each year. Maybe just an addendum or update of proposed changes, etc., could be sent in so that the entire proposal would be done only every third year or so. Give us time to do what we're trained to do—teach!

GWENCAROL H. HOLMES

Chapter 1 Reading and Math Teacher
Wichita, Kansas

The following strengths and weaknesses of the Chapter 1 program come from the viewpoint of a Chapter 1 reading and math teacher on the elementary level in a Midwest city of over 300,000 people.

Chapter 1 is a vital element in the education of low-income students. It is a recognition of the extra hurdles these students face in receiving an education. It provides additional attention and instruction to those students who so desperately need it. In addition, Chapter 1 provides help and training for parents so that they too may participate and assist in the education of their children.

The weakness of Chapter 1 is that it tends to stay in its own little isolated area, providing assistance to students and affecting only one portion of the student's education. Chapter 1 needs to be aggressive, influencing and helping to shape all areas of the educational program which affect the student's education. (It is beginning to do this with better classroom and Chapter 1 correlation, schoolwide programs, etc. However it is not nearly aggressive enough.) Chapter 1 should help shape the entire educational environment of the low-income student.

- ***One way to affect the total school environment is to demand that low-income students have only the best teachers.***

Recognition, perks, reduced class size, and money need to be provided to recruit and keep the very best teachers in the schools of these students. Once the best teachers are in place they need to be provided with the best materials and frequent in-services to keep their skills up-to-date with the latest research findings. Also these teachers and the staff (social worker, nurse, counselor, principal, etc.) need time to meet and plan as a team. Some of these concerns are being addressed by schoolwide projects, but much still remains to be done.

- ***Schoolwide programs need to start with the*** best ***teachers, not just those already in that school.***

Also schoolwide projects are available only in schools where 75 percent or more of the children come from low-income families. Help to upgrade the educational program should be available to even more schools. Even schools with 50 percent low-income families have significant obstacles to overcome when they start with at least 50 percent of their students at-risk. They need aggressive assistance in doing it.

- ***In addition Chapter 1 needs to demand that adequate social services are provided to students and their families so that the students and schools can focus on education and maximize their time and effort on education.***

Also extended day programs could be of great benefit to Chapter 1 students if they were available as a regular part of the educational program and not as an extra. Chapter 1 students need additional time to "catch-up" on those educational competencies many other children bring to school. An extended day is a viable means of allowing low-income students to narrow the gap between themselves and other students. However, the extended day needs to be an integral portion of the educational program with means provided for all eligible students to attend and the requirement that they do attend.

Chapter 1 offers much to assist the low-income student. However, the difficulties these students face continue to grow, and Chapter 1 must be aggressive and comprehensive in helping these students overcome these obstacles.

PATRICIA E. LUCAS
Principal, Manatee High School
Bradenton, Florida

I offer the following comments:

- The reauthorization of Chapter 1 should have as its goal the establishing of more flexibility in fund use with the intent of improving services to Chapter 1 children.
- Chapter 1 has been based upon inputs. It needs to move toward targeting outputs.
- Instruction needs to move toward teaching for *meaning* instead of a "drill-and-kill" focus.
- Assessment of Chapter 1 is driving the programs. National assessment of program effectiveness should be separated from state and local assessment of student progress. Currently one test tries to measure all.
- Chapter 1 should have the same curriculum standards as other programs, not separate standards.
- New legislation should be mindful of administrative burden.
- Program improvement procedures have focused upon the identification of deficient schools based upon lack of student gains. Procedures need to provide more help once schools are identified.

GAYNOR McCOWN

Teacher
New York, New York

As this commentary is being written (August 1992), I am helping to start a new school in the Lower East Side of Manhattan, where I will be teaching in the fall. We will have one staff person paid for through Chapter 1 funding. For the past five years, I have been working at Bronx Regional High School, an alternative school for young people who have left other public schools in New York. The school is located in one of the poorest congressional districts in the country. Therefore, Chapter 1 has been an important factor in the funding of our school.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Possibilities for program improvement if federal funding for the education of disadvantaged students increased substantially would include smaller schools and smaller class sizes. Study after study has shown that young people learn more and thrive in environments where they can get the attention they need and deserve. Large classes (over 20) make it impossible to create a context within which each young person can get what they need. Regardless of the curriculum or the teacher, large classes are not places where real learning can take place. They are places where the teacher is forced to spend an inordinate amount of time assuming control of a class in which very little learning can take place.

In addition to smaller class sizes, Chapter 1 funding can be used to provide better materials and overall school conditions. Jonathan Kozol's 1992 book, *Savage Inequalities*, is a good source for understanding the difference in resources and overall conditions in schools around the country. In particular, schools in poor areas of the country's cities have the fewest resources, the worst conditions, and the most need.

ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

If Chapter 1 money is used to create successful academic programs where real and rigorous learning takes place, students will fare much better in the midst of demands for nationwide standards (this is not meant to be a vote in support of national standards) and new assessment systems. While the increase of federal money will not solve all of the ills of the nation's schools, it will give young people in poor areas a fighting chance.

If schools in poor areas do a quality job of teaching young people, they may become the choice school. However, that is not going to happen without an increase in funding because the funding for schools in other areas is generated by property taxes. Therefore, the government must compensate that in one way or another. Young people cannot suffer or be denied an education because they happen to live in a poor area. Otherwise, we will continue to be a "nation at risk."

The money must be allocated, however, with a built in system of accountability. Programs should be funded based on their philosophy and vision of education. This has to be done in a way other than filling out standardized forms that have no meaning. Otherwise, the money will not be used properly, and this will only feed the argument that money is not part of the equation. Clearly, it is part of the equation, but the money should be serving the purpose of improving the academic program in schools that serve the needs of the poor and disadvantaged.

ELIGIBILITY AND SERVICES

Specifically, the resources and local services needed to facilitate educational reform include: health facilities, job development and placement, family planning, and other social services, such as counseling. The focus on the funding should be based on preventive services as well as services to rectify existing problems. Ultimately, that is where the money will be saved.

One of the primary criteria necessary for determining a school's eligibility for Chapter 1 funding is some type of evaluation to ascertain that individual and small groups of children are and will continue to receive needed services. The method of distribution must ensure that the needs of communities that are historically neglected are being met. If schools compete for Chapter 1 funds, then it may be a possible indication that there are not enough funds and education is not enough of a priority. If competition for funds is the reality then the federal agenda must be reconsidered.

With reference to the local services provided with Chapter 1 moneys, the work should be more individualized and small group oriented. As a result, pullout programs would be understood to serve the needs of all. The concept of pullout programs need not have negative connotations because if planned properly, they can benefit all children.

Whole schools must often be upgraded in order to provide a quality education for the students. Otherwise, improvements are only stopgap measures to get over a particular hurdle. Schoolwide improvement projects will give schools an opportunity to assess the needs and implement programs that will benefit the entire community. While student targeting is important, there are many students who are not targeted and fall through the cracks. Schoolwide improvements will help decrease this.

MARILYN McKNIGHT

Teacher
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The ultimate value of any educational program is determined by the extent to which it improves the quality of teaching and learning that takes place. Any analysis of the strengths or shortcomings of such programs, even a program of the magnitude of Chapter 1, must concentrate on the impact of that program on real students and real teachers in educational settings.

As Congress deliberates on the reauthorization of Chapter 1 and examines federal policy options, it will, I hope, consider students as well as statistics and classes as well as test scores. Concern for the human element must be the primary determining factor in renewing or reformulating the Chapter 1 program. Without close consideration of this factor, any well-intentioned congressional support or allocation of resources may fall sadly short of the goal of providing quality education for all students.

I base the comments that follow on my understanding of the educational goals of Chapter 1, on my experiences as an educator directly involved in a schoolwide Chapter 1 program in a large, urban, bilingual school in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and on my work as a researcher and coauthor of a 1985 congressionally mandated study of the selection processes used in the Chapter 1 program.

During the past two years, I have taught in a schoolwide Chapter 1 program in a K-6 school with over 900 students (approximately 1 percent of the student population of the Milwaukee Public School District). Over 80 percent of the children in the school receive free or reduced-price lunch. Of the total school population, approximately 45 percent are Hispanic, 25 percent African-American, and lesser percentages Native and Asian-American. The school, the second largest elementary school in Wisconsin, operates in an ethnically diverse, low-income area of Milwaukee, and reflects many of the needs and problems of the district as a whole.

The Chapter 1 program at the school has completed the second year of a three-year project. Functioning essentially as a *developmental* pullout program, it is designed to ensure that in the areas of reading and math no student is in a class of more than 20 children. Specific blocks of time are designated each day for reading and math, and, because of the large number of students involved, there is very little flexibility in the scheduling of other activities.

Specific teachers are designated as Chapter 1 teachers who pull out six to eight students from one or two self-contained classes, take the students to another (generally much smaller) classroom, and conduct class using the same text materials that the regular classroom teacher is using with the remaining students. Any activities that are begun in either class during that "pullout" time are subject to the time constraints of the Chapter 1 schedule.

The basic premise of this program is undeniably strong—to provide effective, small-group instruction to all students in the school. The program specifically addresses the Chapter 1 mandate to provide better educational opportunities for low-achieving students from low-income families. Any financial resources provided by the federal government for the students in this schoolwide program are not only worthwhile, but also absolutely essential for continuing the efforts to improve the quality of education, and ultimately the quality of life, for all children in the school.

I have, however, been concerned about several aspects of the Chapter 1 program during the two years that I have worked as a teacher in the program. My main concern has been the practice of pulling students out of their class to provide instruction. Whether students are pulled out for only one area of instruction (reading or math) or for both, there is little doubt in my mind that the children who are pulled lose a very important bond to the other students in the class and to the teacher. They are also unable to take advantage of the continuity of instruction that takes place in self-contained classrooms, particularly at the elementary level, where there is considerable emphasis on cooperative learning and integration of content areas.

Disadvantaged students have particularly strong needs for security, consistency, and continuity in the school setting, since these characteristics are often weak or totally absent from the home environment. Educators must, therefore, recognize and address these needs, as well as the basic academic requirements, when designing educational programs. Districts and teachers must utilize all available financial resources to create a strong, stable framework for instruction—a framework that allows and encourages all students to maximize their potential and achieve success in all areas.

That leads me to another concern that I have regarding the methods used to determine the success of individual students and schools. At the present, the funding of the program is often contingent upon the overall improvement of students' scores on nationally standardized achievement tests.

Standardized tests, often of questionable value when administered to disadvantaged students, are required as a measure of accountability to determine the success or failure of program implementation. Little or no teacher interpretation or consultation is utilized in the determination of program success. Little or no teacher analysis is sought to clarify changing needs, problems, accomplishments, or successes. Standardized test scores provide only one possible measure of the actual learning of students, and that measure is often questionable.

Certainly, assessment of programs is essential for the same reason that it is essential for individual students and classes—as a guideline for improvement in the delivery of services. But to provide or withhold Chapter 1 funding based only (or primarily) on test scores is inappropriate and can be counterproductive. Alternative forms of assessment and program accountability must be considered, including narrative teacher assessment, if the Chapter 1 goal to provide a better education for disadvantaged students is to be achieved.

Classroom teachers must be allowed much greater involvement in the organization of Chapter 1 programs at the local level. It is they who are closest to the students and, therefore, they who can most effectively determine how to utilize financial resources to achieve desired goals. Teachers must be recognized as professionals and provided the opportunity to determine the most appropriate, effective, and viable solutions to the real problems that they confront every day.

Politicians, policy analysts, and researchers must turn to teachers for advice on educational matters. Answers and solutions to the problems in education must be a collaborative effort, and teachers must be a significant, integral part of the collaborative team.

The issue of increased funding for the Chapter 1 program comes at a time when funding for any federal program will meet with considerable opposition. Nevertheless, this does not preclude the need for increased financial support so that schools can effectively develop the human and material resources that are essential to maintain and improve the services provided by Chapter 1 programs.

My strongest, most specific recommendation regarding funding is this: The best possible use of any increase of funding would be to enrich and expand programs at the earliest levels of education. Preventive programs and developmental programs which provide students with concrete experiences are the most likely to develop learning skills and to instill attitudes that will enable the youngest students to overcome the disadvantages they have encountered.

While I strongly agree with the delivery of integrated services to children and families in crisis, I believe that the resources for such services cannot be derived from Chapter 1 funding. Support staff in schools (i.e., psychologists, social workers, nurses, etc.) can assist children in other than academic areas, but the magnitude of the problem facing families makes it virtually impossible to expand contact to the extent that would be needed.

Chapter 1 funding must be used to address the academic problems confronting the disadvantaged students. Other funding sources must work with the schools, the school districts, and the states to address the sociological, economic, and health problems which undermine the very structure of our society. Chapter 1, as large and complex as it is, is only one step toward helping our children. I hope that any changes that are made in the program will be a step in the right direction.

VICTORIA TEMPLE MEYER

Psychologist, Highline Community School
Aurora, Colorado

At Highline, the Chapter 1 program consists of one full-time teaching slot and one full-time aide position. The teaching position is divided among three teachers: One teacher has a regular classroom but takes responsibility for the learning disabilities (LD) and Chapter 1 services for her 4/5 team; two other teachers provide both LD and Chapter 1 services through a pullout program and consult with different teacher teams. This particular model developed because the Chapter 1 and LD services had been viewed by classroom teachers as not well integrated with what was happening in the regular education classroom.

Chapter 1 students receive their instruction five days per week in groups separate from their classes and in addition to their regular education language arts time. The benefits of integrating the Chapter 1 teachers with various teacher teams include complying with the federal requirements for meeting and consulting with regular education teachers, improving consistency between regular education and Chapter 1 programming, and improving the diagnostic process identifying students' learning needs.

Our school currently uses the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores to identify students; we also follow up with an individual reading inventory to more specifically identify learning needs. While we recognize the need for some method of assessment for identification and accountability, using the ITBS with Chapter 1 students many times appears pointless and painful. We have watched students who know they can't read the items attempt to comply by filling in the circles and crying while doing so.

When the testing is invalid because the child can't complete the tasks, it seems much more productive to use teacher judgment in deciding how to more appropriately assess the child and monitor growth. Another criticism of the ITBS concerns using this one-shot test to measure the effectiveness of a teacher's teaching. Our school and many others currently use a whole-language approach in teaching reading and writing, a method which is not well evaluated by examining ITBS scores. It would be more relevant and worthwhile to be able to offer another measure of growth, such as keeping a portfolio and listing objective criteria to evaluate progress and identify needs.

This leads to the issue of monitoring accountability for progress and effective teaching. While test scores currently are reported on the state and federal level, it seems more meaningful to do this on a district level, where students' progress can be watched more closely and program changes adapted to the needs of different schools. Involving parents in the accountability process seems more worthwhile than expecting Congress to decide who is doing a good job and what programs seem to be working.

The guidelines outlining the Chapter 1 program are both cumbersome and helpful. When compared to guidelines for special education services, Chapter 1 guidelines seem to be getting tighter. The paperwork requirements of recording contacts with classroom teachers are more easily met with our integrated services because these meetings happen routinely during the course of the day. The restriction on the student-teacher ratio makes it easier to draw the line in keeping group size to a manageable and beneficial level, even though classroom teachers at times may feel this is a "luxury" for the Chapter 1 teacher.

One Chapter 1 teacher explored the possibility of going into the regular classroom and team teaching. The feedback we received was that she couldn't go into the classroom because of the paperwork constraints in documenting contact with only Chapter 1 students. In addition to being poor public relations with regular education teachers, it is felt that this policy wastes the Chapter 1 teacher's unique talents in being able to model better teaching skills to other teachers.

The guidelines should allow for more integration and consultation with classroom teachers. This would be particularly beneficial, as students whose scores fall below a certain level receive Chapter 1 services, whereas other students with similar needs who score just above the cutoff will not receive the specialized intervention. While the constraints are difficult at times, it is probably important to keep some guidelines to protect the integrity of the program and not allow the resources to be lost to other programs.

Ideally, we would like to see Chapter 1 programs provide services more connected to regular education teachers, such as attaching a resource teacher to a team who would then help look at a student's entire day and integrate Chapter 1 more into their regular program. We like the idea of tracking the money to the individual student and fear if it just went to the school, in many schools it would be used to meet different needs.

One area of rising need which could eat up nonspecific Chapter 1 money involves teaching students seen as "low IQ"; these students don't qualify for special education, but they require much individualized instruction in the classroom. Using a Chapter 1 teacher more in the classroom may help teachers learn skills to help this population but not compromise the students identified as able to benefit from Chapter 1.

KENWOOD N. NORDQUIST

Principal, Sacajawea School
Great Falls, Montana

The following comments represent my views, as well as those of two of my colleagues in the Great Falls School District: Keith Chapman, principal of Longfellow School, who has the largest low-income and Native American population in our district, and Ann Bartell, supervisor of reading and coordinator of Chapter 1 services for our district.

CHANGES IN THE EXISTING FORMULA

Chapter 1 needs to serve schools within a school district having markedly higher rates of high-risk factors: e.g., low income, large percentages of parents without a high school diploma, and high ratios of single parent families.

Also Chapter 1 needs to provide services to students who have high indicators for school failure, but who may not attend a qualifying Chapter 1 school. Such services might include home/school coordinator services.

Chapter 1 may not be able, by sheer force of funding amounts, to equalize a school's finances. However, Chapter 1 can infuse funds to implement model programs; to add services, such as home visits, that cannot be covered in school budgets; and to provide staff development with an evaluation of student achievement as a component.

Low student academic achievement often results from many causes. If educators do not begin coordinating services with other programs and agencies, they will be doomed to the Band-Aid approach instead of solving the problem. Students do not live in isolation. If the family's problems are not solved, the student's lack of success in school cannot be completely remediated.

LOCAL SERVICES

Programs, such as in-class models, encourage the classroom teacher, as well as Chapter 1 personnel, to take responsibility for a student's learning. To receive Chapter 1 funding, a Chapter 1 school should have to emphasize collaboration and staff development for all teachers in its planning and implementation.

A prevention model with a strong family component is needed. If parents are their children's first and most influential teacher, and if children learn 50 percent to 75 percent of what they are going to learn by the time they are five, more emphasis must be put on programs prior to kindergarten.

- More full day kindergarten programs are needed. Summer programs are a must to maintain and accelerate student learning.

- A prevention model will not solve all problems. Some students may need support all through their K-12 education in order to graduate and continue their education and job-training programs.
- Transient student needs must be researched and addressed. If services in a community could be more coordinated, perhaps families would have more incentives to remain in a given community and provide a child with a more stable environment.
- Since a parent's education is the prime factor in a child's achievement in school, more incentives are needed to increase parent education levels and opportunities.
- Schoolwide improvement programs not based on failure or low achievement alone would inspire school personnel to evaluate student development on more than standardized tests. Schoolwide goals could then be based on creating family learning environments and collaborating with other service agencies to encourage positive successful family settings for students.
- To remediate and effect real change in student achievement, Chapter 1 services need to support a successful home and school environment for students with high risk for school failure.

HILDA S. PIERCE

Chapter 1 Reading Teacher
Lexington, Kentucky

According to a growing consensus, Chapter 1 works and it increases the achievement of low-achieving, disadvantaged students. I agree. Achievement of the low-performing students has increased in recent years as a result of Chapter 1 services according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

STRENGTHS OF OUR CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM

- Open house for Chapter 1 parents.
- "Make and Take" workshops, including skill activities to help child at home; parent participation in classroom activities; and vocabulary cards.
- Reading night for parents and children, including a workshop on reporting student progress to parents by the Chapter 1 coordinator; parents reading to children; and giving books to children, with Chapter 1 providing books for identified Chapter 1 students and the PTA providing for others.
- Parent resource center, including resource materials, skill games, vocabulary cards, books, etc.; "Where There's a Will There's An A"; information pamphlets on Chapter 1 and community services; and new and innovative books for check-out.
- "No TV for Four Weeks," with invitations sent to parents and reading buttons given to those who participated; workshop for training and parent input; parent participation, including in activities and in keeping data and signed records; and incentives provided for Chapter 1 pupils by Chapter 1 funds.
- Classroom teachers and Chapter 1 staff joining together to enhance reading by holding two "High Performance" workshops; "Big Books and More" in-service (whole-language approach in reading); "Author A Month" in-service (whole-language approach); and grade-level meetings for Chapter 1 and classroom teachers for better teamwork.

Weaknesses

- Lack of Chapter 1 primary math remediation
- Too few Chapter 1 social workers
- Too much paperwork.

Fayette County, Kentucky, has one of the strongest programs to be found. We received a national award this year for an outstanding job. All of our teachers work hard at making our Chapter 1 program succeed.

MAXINE SKOPOV

Teacher, Bronx Literacy Center
Bronx, New York

The education of disadvantaged high school students can succeed only if it focuses on alternative styles in both programming and teaching. The key word is "alternative." The inherent problems of mass education have less to do with plant facilities and even curriculum than they have to do with class size, flexibility in scheduling, and commitment of all personnel employed in that program to offer services to every student enrolled.

I have been involved in just such an alternative setting for over 8 years. I have also had experience in both a traditional, large comprehensive high school and junior high school. Alternative high schools function on the premise that the traditional American high school is organized like a factory for mass manufacture, as opposed to a smaller workshop where items are handmade. Which product is the more valuable?

Because disadvantaged students frequently have a disproportionate amount of noise, confusion, and flux in their lives, they need consistency, stability, and familiarity. This can best be achieved by self-contained classrooms; it might involve what is known as "core" or team teaching. The academic proficiency of the pedagogical staff would be utilized in such a way as to minimize the number of teachers the student has to deal with (who otherwise never get to know the student on any real, personal basis). The duration of class sessions should be necessarily lengthened so as to allow for the smooth flow and continuity of a truly integrated curriculum; and the horribly intrusive "bell system" could thus be suspended.

Nonacademic assistance or support should also not be available along rigid boundaries of qualification or hierarchy of procedure. While a chain of command is necessary, in practice there must be a willingness to suspend this order when the need arises, so as to be responsive to students at all times. More important is that individual strengths of all staff members are to be encouraged. A family atmosphere is thereby fostered so that students feel connected to, and part of, a small community rather than isolated and nameless faces in a large, impersonal crowd.

Support can come from teachers, guidance counselors, administration, paraprofessionals, or even the office staff, if appropriate. Issues to be addressed may include health problems, domestic disturbances, peer pressure, job placement, drugs, sex, and of course, the interaction of all of the above. Staff members should discuss the proper handling of sensitive issues on an ongoing basis, and the process of referrals to professionals outside the school should be maximized and evaluated regularly.

Are any of the aforementioned items, however briefly stated, at all feasible or practical in large, urban systems, without the construction of buildings or considerable outlay of funds? While the model I am suggesting consists of small, manageable units of no more than a few hundred students and staff, at most, there is no reason why this cannot be accomplished (or at least tried) using existing space.

My current school is housed in a building with four individual alternative programs. Although we share custodial and cafeteria services, etc., we operate each independently of the others. Each program has its own unique mission (such as an educational program for pregnant girls); each is assigned its own floor(s); and each has its own supervisory staff, budget, materials, and supplies. Why can't this be replicated—at least to some extent—in any large high school?

Confining students to their own turf certainly decreases the tendency for some to "wander" around and get into trouble or cut classes. It would also, one hopes, decrease the intolerable noise level and crowded hallways which so often lead to incidents and confrontations. In such a setting, students will be programmed according to individual academic *and* social needs, and not just according to which English and science classes they have to take. The benefits should be obvious, and nothing is inherently there to dictate the expenditure of funds which would not already be in place in any sound educational endeavor.

While much of the preceding may seem somewhat simplistic and underdrawn, please believe that there is a huge network of the type of schools I have described in New York City. They function beautifully. Because students are treated as whole persons, and not just as temporary occupants of one of 30 seats in a room, they feel cared for; they feel respected. And, shocking as it may sound, they, in turn, respect the teachers! Morale among teachers in alternative schools is amazingly high. When both the learner and the instructor can be involved in the educational process, I'd say this is a major step forward in American education.

SHEILA SLATER
Teacher, Bronx Literacy Center
Bronx, New York

The issue of nonequalization of funding levels in different school districts greatly impinges on the quality of education in those districts. Unfortunately, these are also the areas in our country where support and community services have declined or don't exist at all. Schools and successful educational outcomes suffer in communities in which human needs are not being met. Once again the quality of life prevalent in the schools and communities of poor urban and rural communities reflects hopelessness and despair.

Young people must be able to see a future for themselves filled with hope and promise in a world in which they can effect change. We are clearly at a disadvantage without the ingredient of a hopeful future as an incentive for young people today.

Some of the important considerations for Title I funding allocations should ensure that the needs of the underserved historically are being met. Are schools and districts in competition for Title I funds because they are not receiving enough funds for education in general? If so, does this reflect a lack of priority of education at present on the national agenda, both on the federal and the state levels? The RAND study, one hopes, will reflect the need for advocacy concerning the lack of educational resources nationwide, whatever formulas are devised to create more equity in distribution of Title I allocations.

The lack of educational priority and the continued use of rhetoric concerning the importance of education require a call for a serious commitment. The federal government must seek ways of compensating for the inequality of education funding that is generated primarily through property taxes (refer to Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities*).

Of course the special needs of individual students targeted for Chapter 1 assistance must be met, and appropriate evaluative tools should be improved to ascertain that information. But the problem must also be viewed from a broader perspective. When poor health facilities and other social services, such as counseling, job development and real jobs, family planning and decent housing are sorely needed in a community, their absence is bound to affect the educational experience of the children in that community, even if the educational programs are of superior quality. This is not to say that the quality of those programs is insignificant, but it is to draw attention to the fact that educational success is also related to other factors in society.

Within the actual community of the school, factors such as the availability of materials and resources, a thoughtfully developed library as a resource to the curriculum needs of the school, and a staff which has the time to plan and pay attention to the needs of the children are all important factors to the success of any individual student in the school.

I suggest that the entire school be viewed as a community which has an effect on any other particular segment of the community, and consequently it is necessary to raise the quality of life throughout. This should be done, however, in conjunction with providing special services to those in the greatest need. Within this context, I would suggest that if within the life of the school the work is more individualized and small-group oriented, pullout programs would be more commonplace and be understood to serve the needs of all students. The concept of pullout programs need not have negative connotations and can benefit all children.

JOAN STOLTZ

Teacher, Hohokam School
Phoenix, Arizona

CHAPTER 1 OPERATIONS

As a Chapter 1 teacher I carry out policies others have formulated. As I read "flexibility in Chapter 1," I became aware of options previously unknown to me. It is extremely important that there be flexibility in delivery of services so that a given staff can implement the program using its resources efficiently. I don't see that as being the same in every school.

I am very careful to serve those most in need. The selection process, though time consuming, includes sound criteria. Many classroom teacher recommendations that service is needed are too subjective. The Chapter 1 teacher must also consider results of diagnostic screening as an indicator of need. Criterion-referenced tests should be used to ascertain students' needs and to measure progress at the year's end. We are required to give standardized, norm-referenced tests. Timed tests!

Students eligible for Chapter 1 can't succeed on timed, norm-referenced tests. Still, such tests are required, although they tell us what we already know, frustrate the students, and painfully remind them of their failure. And these standardized tests are in addition to whatever proficiency tests they've already struggled with in the regular classroom! Is this a desirable reward? Is it necessary?

Chapter 1 operates largely in isolation from other federal programs, and I urge keeping it that way. I can support the idea of coordination with vocational education, for that seems a natural progression. However, students in special education have needs which result in much lower rates of progress, and they have far less potential for acquiring skills of the average classroom student.

Chapter 1 has historically focused on those from an impoverished environment with normal abilities to learn. The learning-disabled and emotionally disadvantaged have problems far more severe than the Chapter 1 population I have served. I think if funded as one, Chapter 1 will receive less because that group will be judged as having fewer needs.

NONTRADITIONAL SERVICES

Our school was fortunate to add a Chapter 1 preschool this year. One of the most positive parts of the educational process was the addition of the parent education classes. I cannot understand why parents are not required to participate in such classes at all levels of Chapter 1 instruction. It should be a condition for service to their children. Academic gains would rise significantly, I believe.

Chapter 1 summer programs are an excellent idea. Our school is also studying the year-round school concept; I think that makes good educational sense. Too much time on task is lost with a three-month break. An incentive for summer programs to become reality would be to fund them separately.

I believe use of computer technology should be encouraged too. Children are interested in computers and that motivation promotes time on task. Computers seem to help children with short attention spans to focus better. The immediate feedback is a positive feature too.

The last positive I will list is that of Chapter 1 funds used for staff development on the local level. Just as important as the knowledge imparted is the team building between the Chapter 1 instructor and the homeroom teachers.

TEACHER (anonymous)

Roanoke, Virginia

Chapter 1 is a very essential part of our school division. Presently, a school qualifies as Chapter 1 by economic conditions of the student population. Then the student qualifies by test scores below 40 percent on the Survey of Basic Skills (SBS) test.

Our school division has a preschool program and an extended instructional program (after school) and serves grades 1-8. The individual schools are allowed some choice as to the type of program that they wish to have. We have some pullout and some in-class models.

I have worked with both of these models and feel that the pullout is best. These are the reasons why. While I can appreciate the argument for in-class because of labeling of students, I disagree that it is the best. With the in-class model, one teacher was so loud with her students that the small group I worked with couldn't hear me.

Another teacher totally ignored me and didn't have furniture or students in place when I arrived. By the time I got the Chapter 1 students together and pulled them aside, we had lost 10-15 minutes of instructional time. A third class was a "low" reading group with half Chapter 1 students. I taught all of them. The classroom teacher felt this was a good time to take a break or do other things.

Of course, this type of problem should be handled through administrative channels, but neither the principal nor the Chapter 1 administrative staff wanted to handle this situation. When the Chapter 1 teacher walks into another teacher's classroom, he or she must tread carefully because it is another person's domain.

The in-class model also does not eliminate the labeling. The other students see the Chapter 1 student laboring during the process of instruction. If the Chapter 1 student is pulled out and later returns to class with a neat finished product, the other students note this and many beg to be in Chapter 1.

I'm now pulling my students out. They get the small group instruction that they need, they do not have the distractions that they had in class, they are given additional instruction with skills sometimes taught prior to classroom instruction. When this is done, it builds their self-esteem because they know the skills before their classmates.

I have students who ask why they can't be in the extended instruction program, Chapter 1 summer school, and the Chapter 1 program. I do not observe labeling among the students. The only labeling that I see is among educators and the parents. This is done regardless of in-class or pullout. So why not pull out and enable the student to make greater progress because of small group instruction without the distractions and the students will not need to be in the program as long.

More disadvantaged students would be reached if there were Chapter 1 teachers in all schools regardless of economic surveys. Many students in our school division are not receiving the needed help because they are being bused to a non-Chapter 1 school.

Appendix A

LETTER SOLICITING COMMENTARIES

Dear ———:

I am writing as project leader of a study of federal policy options in education funding to ask for your assistance. The RAND Institute on Education and Training is conducting a study to assess alternative approaches to meeting the basic goals of Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the nation's largest federal program for precollege education. The issues the study will address have been selected after consultation with the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. The study, intended to be a comprehensive examination of federal policy options, will be completed in spring 1993, in time for congressional deliberations on the reauthorization of Chapter 1.

This letter invites you to submit a short commentary, approximately two to eight double-spaced pages that (1) discusses the strengths and shortcomings of the current program, and (2) recommends realistic options for reformulating the program (if that appears advisable) while maintaining its focus on the education of low-income students. We are inviting similar commentaries from other educators, policymakers, and researchers. With the authors' approval, these commentaries will be published by RAND and will serve as a major source of information for our final report.

The specific topics chosen for discussion are up to each contributor. They may include, for example, the distribution of funds to states, school districts and schools, criteria for selecting students, strategies for program improvement and evaluation, including incentives provided by Chapter 1 provisions that facilitate, or discourage, improvements in the quality of education received by low-income students, coordination with other federal, state, and local programs, and broader issues related to federal aid to education and the role of Chapter 1 in the context of overall education spending.

The attachment describes the study and gives examples of potential policy alternatives. We encourage you to focus on those you consider most important or suggest others if you wish. It will be important to consider the feasibility of the recommended policy options and the level at which the Chapter 1 program is funded (although contributors may also wish to consider how their recommendations would change if, for example, the funding level were to double).

I hope that you will be able to submit a commentary and would appreciate receiving your contribution by May 15 [1992] at RAND's Washington office (2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037-1270). Please feel free to call me at (202) 296-5000 if you have any questions or would like to discuss these matters in more detail.

Sincerely,

Iris C. Rotberg, Ph.D.
Senior Social Scientist

Appendix B

FEDERAL POLICY OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE EDUCATION OF LOW-INCOME STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION

One of the most difficult challenges for U.S. education is providing a better education for students from low-income families. We know from many studies that there is a high intercorrelation between family income, family educational level, and student educational achievement. Low-income children face a double handicap. While their educational needs are greater, they attend schools with substantially lower levels of resources than do more affluent children.

Those broad considerations prompted the RAND Institute on Education and Training to undertake a comprehensive analysis of federal policy options available to improve education in low-income areas. The analysis will focus on Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the nation's $6.7 billion program for "disadvantaged" students. After a quarter-century experience with Chapter 1, it is a particularly appropriate time to review its accomplishments and problems, and to assess options for strengthening the program while maintaining its concentration on the education of disadvantaged students.

The study will consider a broad array of questions. For example, what new possibilities for program improvement would emerge if federal funding for the education of disadvantaged students increased substantially? Is there any reason to believe that disadvantaged students would benefit if the movement toward using Chapter 1 funds for "schoolwide improvement" grows? What are the consequences of alternative approaches for distributing funds and selecting students, and for increasing the level of resources available to low-income school districts? What are the implications for Chapter 1 of recent trends in the incidence of poverty? How will Chapter 1 students fare in the midst of demands for nationwide standards, new assessment systems, and school choice?

The issues the study will address have been selected after consultation with the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. The study will be completed in spring 1993, in time for congressional deliberations on the reauthorization of Chapter 1, the largest federal program assisting elementary and secondary education.

MAJOR ISSUES

Shorn of its legislative and regulatory complexity, Chapter 1 is designed to do two things: (1) deliver federal funds to local school districts responsible for the education of large numbers of young people from low-income families, and (2) supplement the educational services provided in those districts to "educationally disadvantaged" students. RAND will focus on those two themes, resources and local services, in the context of changing societal conditions and recent trends in educational reform.

Resources

School districts with ten or more children from families below the poverty level are eligible to receive Chapter 1 funds. Funding is directed by a formula that provides funds to counties in each state based on counts of low-income children and state per pupil expenditures. States divide county allocations of Chapter 1 funds (as determined by the incidence of poverty) among school districts whose borders are not coterminous with counties. School districts, in turn, allocate funds to schools based on a range of poverty and achievement criteria.

In general, districts and schools receive larger amounts of Chapter 1 funding as their proportion of students from low-income homes increases. Nevertheless, analysts have long been concerned that it is difficult to concentrate sufficient funds to make a difference when the allocation formula provides assistance to 90 percent of school districts (only very small districts or districts that choose not to have Chapter 1 programs are excluded) and districts, in turn, enjoy wide latitude in defining the universe of eligible schools. Approximately 75 percent of the nation's elementary schools, 50 percent of middle and junior high schools, and 25 percent of high schools receive Chapter 1 funds.

RAND proposes three analyses in the area of Chapter 1 resources. The analyses will be conducted under current funding levels, as well as at higher levels, perhaps as high as a doubling of current resources.

- **Changes in the Existing Formula.** RAND will assess the allocation consequences of modifying the existing funds allocation formula, e.g., increasing the threshold numbers of low-income children determining district eligibility or concentrating funds on the lowest-income schools while maintaining current allocation patterns to districts.
- **Chapter 1 as a School Finance Lever.** Whatever its funding level, Chapter 1 can play only a limited role in equalizing school finance. With federal assistance at approximately 6 percent of elementary and secondary education expenditures, Chapter 1 cannot possibly overcome the large financial advantages of schools in wealthy and middle-class communities. The study will investigate the possibility of encouraging greater equalization either by increasing federal funding or by using federal funds as an incentive for increased state spending on low-income school districts.

- **Chapter 1 and Other Categorical Aid.** Chapter 1 operates largely in isolation from other federal and state categorical aid programs (for example, bilingual, special, and vocational education programs). The study will examine the feasibility of increasing the coordination between Chapter 1 and related federal and state programs.

Local Services

Chapter 1 currently focuses on providing supplemental services for individually selected students. Analysts consider the program to have been quite successful in carrying out that objective, and prior evaluations define the extra amount of time spent each day in such activities as reading and mathematics. Many administrators and teachers, both Chapter 1 and regular school staff, report that the program is essential to their work with disadvantaged youngsters. At the same time, concerns about labeling children, pulling Chapter 1 students out of regular classrooms, and encouraging separate instructional and evaluation processes are widespread.

RAND proposes three analyses in the area of local services. It is probably the case that each of the policy options will have different implications for affluent and poor school districts. The study will try to accommodate those differences. In addition, the study will assess the consequences of alternative strategies for local program evaluation and accountability in the context of each of the options.

- **Maintain the Emphasis on Supplemental Services.** The study will assess the strengths and drawbacks of the current approach and consider how it might be modified, if that appears advisable, to better serve low-income children without encouraging instructional, administrative, and evaluation practices inconsistent with sound educational practice.
- **Facilitate Schoolwide Improvement.** Schoolwide projects are permissible in the lowest-income schools under current Chapter 1 guidelines. The rationale for such projects is that many poor schools do not have the resources needed to provide a high-quality education. Therefore, the best way to help disadvantaged students may be to upgrade the school as a whole. However, the approach is not used more widely because there are concerns about the consequences of eliminating student targeting requirements—first, because Chapter 1 funds may be used to support improvements that do not benefit disadvantaged students and, second, because the critical mass of resources needed to make an important difference in target schools nationwide has not been available. The study will examine the feasibility of encouraging schoolwide projects under alternative resource allocation assumptions, anticipated effects on students served, and mechanisms for ensuring that the educational needs of disadvantaged students are not overlooked in schoolwide improvement efforts.
- **Increase the Emphasis on Nontraditional Services.** Since Chapter 1 was first enacted in 1965, conditions for many American families and communities have changed dramatically. In many Chapter 1-eligible districts, family poverty in the last ten years has increased and community services have declined. The study

will examine the feasibility, costs, and potential benefits of encouraging greater use of Chapter 1 funds for preschool programs, integrated services to children and families, after-school and summer efforts, high school programs, and other programs that might provide educational benefits to families in crisis.

STUDY PROCESS

In conducting the study, RAND's Institute on Education and Training plans to draw on several sources of information. First, the Institute will conduct a comprehensive review of existing evaluation data on Chapter 1. Second, RAND will commission papers on discrete aspects of Chapter 1, e.g., funds allocation, services delivered, and program evaluation. Third, the study will invite educators, policymakers, and researchers to describe the strengths and shortcomings of Chapter I as currently conceived and to suggest alternative approaches. Fourth, RAND will analyze Chapter I funding in the context of overall education spending. Finally, the study will analyze a variety of policy alternatives in terms of their effects on funds allocation, student participation, costs, and educational outcomes.

REFERENCES

Allington, Richard L. (1991). "Effective literacy instruction for at-risk children," in *Better Schooling for the Children of Poverty: Alternatives to Conventional Wisdom*, M. S. Knapp and P. M. Shields (eds.). Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.

——— (1990). "Redesigning the delivery of Chapter 1 instructional services in rural schools." Paper prepared for the Rural Technical Assistance Center; Region 1.

——— and P. Johnston (1989). "Coordination, collaboration and consistency: The redesign of compensatory and special education interventions," in R. E. Slavin, N. L. Karweit, N. L. Madden, and N. A. Madden (eds.), *Effective Programs for Students at Risk*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

——— and Anne McGill-Franzen (Fall 1990). "Children with reading problems: How we wrongfully classify them and fail to teach many to read." *Spectrum: Journal of School Reading and Information*, Vol. 8, No. 4.

America 2000: An Education Strategy (1991). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Ashton, P., and L. Crocker (May-June 1987). "Systematic study of planned variations: The essential focus of teacher education reform," *Journal of Teacher Education*.

Barr, R., and R. Dreeben (1983). *How Schools Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bempechat, J., and H. P. Ginsburg (1989). "Underachievement and educational disadvantaged: The home and school experience of at-risk youth." U.S. Department of Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Benveniste, Guy (1986). "Implementation and intervention strategies," in D. Kirp and D. Jensen (eds.), *School Days, Rule Days*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Best, Francine, "The educational priority area (ZEP) policy: A response to the 'children-at-risk problem.'" A case study of the Education Priority Area of Alencon-Perseigne. Paris: Inspecteur general de l'Education Nationale, Education Priority Area Assessment Task Force.

Birman, B. B., M. E. Orland, R. K. Jung, R. J. Anson, and G. N. Garcia (1987). *The Current Operation of the Chapter One Program.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Boyer, Ernest (1983). *High School.* New York: Harper and Row.

Brookover, W., C. Beady, P. Flood, J. Schweitzer, and J. Wisenbaker (1979). *School Social Systems and Students' Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference.* New York: Praeger.

Brynelson, Wade (July 6, 1992). "Comments regarding CCSSO Working Paper on Hawkins-Stafford Reauthorization." Memorandum to Gail ImObersteg.

Carroll, J. B. (1987). "The national assessments in reading: Are we misreading the findings?" *Phi Delta Kappan,* 68, 424-428.

Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report (December 20, 1991). Contract No. LC89038001.

Child Trends, Inc. (1989). "State data profiles on children," unpublished manuscript. Washington, D.C.

Clark, R. (1989). *The Role of Parents in Ensuring Education Success in School Restructuring Efforts.* Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.

Cohen, David, and James Spillane (1992). "Policy and practice: The relations between governance and instruction," in *Review of Research in Education, Vol. 18,* Gerald Grant (ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Education Research Association.

Coleman, J. S., E. Q. Campbell, C. J. Hobson, J. McPartland, A. M. Mood, F. D. Weinfield, and R. L. York (1966). *Equity of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Comer, James (1988). "Educating poor minority children." *Scientific American,* Vol. 259, No. 5, 42-48.

Commission on Chapter 1 (1992). "Commission on Chapter 1: Interim Report." Mimeograph.

——— (December 1992). *Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty.* Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.

Cooper, E., and J. Sherk (1989). "Addressing urban school reform: Issues and alliances." *Journal of Negro Education.* 58 (3):315-33l.

Crandall, V. C. (1969). "Sex differences in expectancy of intellectual and academic reinforcement," in C. P. Smith (ed.), *Achievement-Related Motives and Children.* New York: Russell-Sage.

Crawford, J., and G. Kimball (April 1986). "Chapter 1 evaluations: An alternative model to assess achievement growth." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Cuban, L. (November 1984). "School reform by remote control: SB 813 in California." *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Dar, Y., and N. Resh (1986). *Classroom Composition and Pupil Achievement: A Study of the Effects of Ability-Based Classes.* New York, N.Y.: Gordon.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). "Teacher Quality and Equality," in J. Goodlad and P. Keating (eds.), *Access to Knowledge: An Agenda for Our Nation's Schools.* New York: College Board.

——— (November 1991). "Implications of testing policy for educational quality and equality," *Phi Delta Kappan.*

——— (November 1992). "Teaching and knowledge: Policy implications of alternate routes to teacher certification," *Peabody Journal of Education.*

Davis, Donna G. (1986). "A pilot study to assess equity in selected curricular offerings across three diverse schools in a large urban school district: A search for methodology." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Dreeben, Robert (Winter 1987). "Closing the divide: What teachers and administrators can do to help black students reach their reading potential." *American Educator.*

——— and A. Gamoran (1986). "Race, instruction, and learning," *American Sociological Review,* 51(5).

——— and R. Barr (1987). "Class composition and the design of instruction." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Druva, C. A., and R. D. Anderson (1983). "Science teacher characteristics by teacher behavior and by student outcome: A meta-analysis of research," *Journal of Research in Science Teaching,* 20(5), pp. 467-479.

Dweck, C. S., and B. G. Licht (1980). "Learned helplessness and intellectual ability," in M. P. Seligman (ed.), *Human Helplessness: Theory and Applications.* New York: Academic Press.

Edmonds, R. (1979). "Effective schools for the urban poor." *Educational Leadership.* 37, 1:15-24.

Education Funding Research Center (1989). *Chapter 1 Handbook: Understanding and Implementing the Chapter 1 Program Including Provisions of the Hawkins-Stafford Education Act.*

Education Week (September 9, 1992). "New York embraces old idea from Britain in developing new way to evaluate schools."

Educational Leadership, (October 1989). "On parents and schools: A conversation with Joyce Epstein."

Educational Testing Service (1991). *The State of Inequality.* Princeton.

Elam, P., and V. Land (1991). *Oklahoma City Public School District Chapter 1, 1990-91.* Oklahoma City: Oklahoma City Public Schools.

Elmore, R. F., ed. (1990). *Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Entwistle, D., and L. Hayduk (1981). "Academic expectations and the school achievement of young children." *Sociology of Education*, 54, 34-50.

Evertson, C., W. Hawley, and M. Zlotnick (1985). "Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), pp. 2-12.

Fagan, Thomas W., and Camilla A. Heid (April 1991). "Chapter 1 Program Improvement: Opportunity and Practice," *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Fordham, S., and J. Ogbu (1986). "Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of 'acting white.'" *The Urban Review*, 18, 176-206.

Goodlad, John (1984). *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1990). "Changing school structures to benefit high-risk youth," in P. E. Leone (ed.), *Understanding Troubled and Troubling Youth.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Gottfredson, G. D. (April 1988). "You get what you measure, you get what you don't: Higher standards, higher test scores, more retention in grade." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans.

Gursky, Daniel (June-July 1990). "The greatest challenge. A plan that works." *Teacher Magazine.*

Henry, M. (1990). "Bridges"—An intragency collaboration to reduce "risk" factors in "at-risk youth." Proposal to United Way of Delaware. Wilmington, Del.: Delaware Guidance Services for Children and Youth.

Kelly, F. J., D. J. Veldman, and C. McGuire (1964). "Multiple discriminate prediction of delinquency and school dropouts." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 24, 535-544.

Kennedy, M. M., B. F. Birman, and R. E. Demaline (1986). *The Effectiveness of Chapter 1 Services.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Kennedy, M. M., R. K. Jung, and M. E. Orland (1986). *Poverty, Achievement, and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Kimbrough, J. M., and P. T. Hill (1981). *The Aggregate Effects of Federal Education Programs.* Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, R-2638-ED.

Kirp, D., and D. Jensen, eds. (1986). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Kirst, Michael W. (1987). *The Condition of Children in California.* Berkeley, Calif.: Policy Analysis for California Education.

——— (January 1992). "Financing School-linked Services," USC Center for Research in Education Finance, Policy Brief No. 7.

Klugman, E., S. Carter, and S. Israel (1979). *Too Many Pieces: A Study of Teacher Fragmentation in the Elementary School.* Boston: Wheelock-Malden Teacher Corps Collaborative.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools.* New York: Crown Publications.

LeTendre, Mary Jean (April 1991). "Improving Chapter 1 Programs: We Can Do Better," *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Levin, H. (1987). "Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students." *Educational Leadership,* 44(6), 19-21.

Lieberman, A., L. Darling-Hammond, and D. Zuckerman (1991). *Early Lessons in Restructuring Schools.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching.

Lloyd, D. N. (1978). Prediction of school failure from third-grade data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 38, 1193-1200.

Lytle, J., and S. Davidoff (1989). "The promise of schoolwide projects." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Madaus, G. F., M. West, M. Harmon, R. Lomax, and K. Viator (1992). *The Influence of Testing on Teaching Math and Science in Grades 4-12.* Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Boston College Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy.

McKnight, C. C., F. J. Crosswhite, J. A. Dossey, E. Kifer, S. O. Swafford, K. J. Travers, and T. J. Cooney (1987). *The Underachieving Curriculum: Assessing U.S. School Mathematics from an International Perspective.* Champaign, Ill.: Stipes Publishing.

Metz, M. H. (1978). *Classrooms and Corridors: The Crisis of Authority in Desegregated Secondary Schools.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Meyer, John (1986). "Organizational factors affecting legalization," in D. Kirp and D. Jensen (eds.), *School Days, Rule Days.* Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Miller, J. A. (March 25, 1992). "Improvement plan for Chapter 1 seen needing overhaul." *Education Week.* 32:1.

Minnich, Elizabeth (1990). *Transforming Knowledge.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press.

"Mr. Clinton's Chapter 1," *The Washington Post* (editorial), November 12, 1992.

NAEYC, National Association for the Education of Young Children (1988). "NAEYC position statement on developmentally appropriate practice in the primary grades, serving 5 through 8 year olds." *Young Children.* January 1988:64-84.

——— (1991). "Guidelines for appropriate curriculum content and assessment in programs serving children ages 3 through 8." *Young Children,* 46(3):21-38.

National Health/Education Consortium (1990). *Crossing the Boundaries Between Health and Education.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership and the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality.

National Research Council (1982). *Ability Testing: Uses, Consequences, and Controversies.* Alexandra K. Wigdor and Wendell R. Garner (eds.). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

"New York embraces old idea from Britain in developing new way to evaluate schools," *Education Week* (September 9, 1992).

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

——— (1987). *Improving Inner-City Schools: Current Directions in Urban District Reform.* Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, JNE-02.

———, T. H. Ormseth, R. M. Bell, P. Camp (1990). *Multiplyinq Inequalities: The Effects of Race, Social Class, and Tracking on Opportunities to Learn Mathematics and Science.* Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, R-3928-NSF.

Ogbu, J. (1988). "Diversity and equity in public education: Community forces and minority school adjustment and performance," in R. Haskins and D. MacRae (eds.), *Policies for America's Public Schools.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex 127-170.

"On parents and schools: A conversation with Joyce Epstein," *Educational Leadership,* October 1989.

Pallas, A., G. Natriello, and E. McDill (1989). The changing nature of the disadvantaged population: Current and future trends. *Educational Research,* Vol. 178, No. 5.

Pressman, J., and A. Wildavsky (1984). *Implementation,* 3d ed., Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pugh, W. C. (1990). "Evaluation of Supplementary Services Centers 1988-89." Philadelphia: The School District of Philadelphia, Educational Programs Research Unit, Office of Assessment.

Rowan, S., and L. Guthrie (1988). *The Quality of Chapter 1 Instruction: Results from a Study of 24 Schools.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Schorr, Lisabeth B. (1988). *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage.* New York: Anchor Press–Doubleday.

Schrag, J. A. (February 19, 1992), quoted in "E.D. Weighs Special Education, Chapter 1 Rule Changes," *Education Week*.

Sevigny, K. E. (1991). *Longitudinal Effects of the Headstart Program, 1987-88 Through 1990-91*. Detroit, Mich.: Detroit Public Schools.

Shepard, L. (1990). *Inflated Test Score Gains: Is It Old Norms or Teaching the Test?* Los Angeles: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, UCLA.

Shortchanging Children (March 20, 1991). "Fiscal inequity and national goals," *Education Week*.

Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Slavin, R. E. (1987). "Making Chapter 1 make a difference." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 110-119.

——— (1990). "On making a difference." *Educational Researcher*, 19(3), 30-34.

——— (April 1991). "Chapter 1: A vision for the next quarter-century." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(8), 586-592.

——— and N. A. Madden (1991). Modifying Chapter 1 program improvement guidelines to reward appropriate practices. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 13, 369-379.

———, N. A. Madden, N. L. Karweit, L. Dolan, and B. A. Wasik (1992). *Success for All: A Relentless Approach to Prevention and Early Intervention in Elementary Schools*. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service.

———, N. L. Kareit, and N. A. Madden, eds. (1989). *Effective Programs for Students at Risk*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

———, N. L. Karweit, and B. A. Wasik (in press). *Preventing Early School Failure*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Soo Hoo, S. (1990). "School renewal: Taking responsibility for providing an education of value," in J. Goodlad and P. Keating (eds.), *Access to Knowledge: An Agenda for Our Nation's Schools*. New York: College Board.

Stainback, W., and S. Stainback (1984). "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education." *Exceptional Children*, 51, 102-112.

Stedman, L. C. (1987). "It's time we changed the effective schools formula." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 3:218.

Stein, M. K., G. Leinhardt, and W. Bickel (1989). "Instructional issues for teaching students at risk," in R. E. Slavin, N. L. Karweit, and N. A. Madden (eds.), *Effective Programs for Students at Risk*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stringfield, S., L. F. Winfield, R. E. Slavin, and M. Milsap (1990). "The Study of Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children." Proposal to U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation.

——— , S. H. Billig, and A. Davis (1991). "Implementing a research-based model of Chapter 1 program improvement." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 600-605.

Taylor, W., and D. Piché (1990). *A Report on Shortchanging Children: The Impact of Fiscal Inequity on the Education of Students at Risk*. Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives.

Trimble, K., and R. L. Sinclair (1986). "Ability grouping and differing conditions for learning: An analysis of content and instruction in ability-grouped classes." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

U.S. Department of Education (1992). *National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program: The Interim Report*. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Compensatory Education Programs (February 1992). *Chapter 1 Flexibility: A Guide to Opportunities in Local Projects*.

Venezky, R. L., and L. F. Winfield (1979). *Schools that Succeed Beyond Expectations in Teaching Reading*. Newark, Del.: University of Delaware, College of Education (ED 177 484).

Walberg, Herbert (1987). "The regular education initiative." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 20, 289-292.

Wiggins, G. (1989). "Teaching to the (authentic) test." *Educational Leadership*, 46(7), 41-47.

Wildavsky, A. (1979). *Speaking Truth to Power*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Winfield, L. F. (1986). "Teacher beliefs toward academically at-risk students in inner urban schools." *The Urban Review*. 18, 4:253-268.

——— (1986). "Do Chapter 1 programs promote educational equity: A review and some comments," *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership* 6(1), 61-71.

——— (1987). "Teachers' estimates of content covered and first grade reading achievement." *Elementary School Journal*, 18(4), 437-454.

——— (1991a). "Resilience, schooling and development in African American Youth: Special Issue," *Education and Urban Society*, 24(1), November.

——— (1991b). "Lessons from the field: Case studies of evolving schoolwide projects." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 13(4), 353-362.

——— and R. Hawkins (April 1992). "A longitudinal analysis of effects of schoolwide projects on the achievement of disadvantaged students." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, Calif.

——— and S. Stringfield (1990). "A description of the implementation of schoolwide projects." CDS Technical Report. The Johns Hopkins University: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Wittrock, M. C. (1986). "Students' thought processes," in *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* New York: Macmillan.

Wright-Edelman, Marian (1987). *Families in Peril: An Agenda for Social Change.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press.

MR-210-II

BEST COPY AVAILABLE